

BACONIANA

VOL. XXXIX (70th Year)

No. 153

DECEMBER, 1955

It should be clearly understood that BACONIANA is a medium for the discussion of subjects connected with the Objects of the Society, but the Council does not necessarily endorse opinions expressed by contributors or correspondents.

EDITORIAL

A bundle of appreciative and well-written press reports on the recent deliberations of Shakespearian scholars at Stratford-on-Avon is before us. There is much in them of interest and value, but almost all seem to halt at the same fence, the point at which one can either advance by free and unfettered study, jumping with the Author to an appreciation of his dramatic purpose, or fall back, gulping at the orthodox Credo, in a desperate attempt to prove the actor's "probable" education, against what little evidence we have.

For example, Professor Dover Wilson, examining the famous question of "small Latin and less Greek" (and of course working backwards) finds that Shakespeare "probably" made sporadic attempts to improve his qualifications as a writer, by reading Ovid and Virgil in Latin. Again, in accepting the legend that Shakespere was educated at the Stratford Grammar School, and removed at an early age to help in the butchery, Professor Wilson must needs accept the "not necessarily contradictory legend that he was for some time a school master in the Country". Both these "legends" have the transparent object of bolstering up the actor's claims to a liberal education. There is still no factual evidence to support either of them. It is a case of wishful thinking, or, as Bacon once called it, *Scientias ad quod vult*, like the extraordinary statement on the cover of the folio facsimile edited by Professor Dover Wilson:

"... the original texts which are now recognised as having been printed from play-house manuscripts, often in Shakespeare's own handwriting ..."

No such manuscripts have ever been found and we still await the finding of a single letter written by Shakespeare to anyone on any subject. It is, therefore, with some relief that we pass to some of the more constructive criticisms of the "Roman Plays".

Mr. Nikolai Okhlopkov, Vice-Minister of Culture in the Soviet Union, is clearly an enthusiast with a deep appreciation of the artistic principles of Shakespeare. His paper—"Hamlet and certain aspects of the humanity to be found in Shakespeare"—was very much appreciated: this was read in English by Mr. George Rylands whose knowledge of the plays and poems is intimate and profound.

The main theme of the conference was the Roman Plays. Professor L. C. Knights emphasized Shakespeare's insistence on the human content of political situations which might have been conceived in more abstract terms. In *Julius Cæsar* he observed "the realm of the personal where truth and men reside" to be contrasted with the "purely political and public realm". He thought (evidently working backwards from the plays) that Shakespeare's "private experiences of the organic life of a small community had contributed to his achievement"! "We hardly pay any attention" he said, "to the influence of Stratford-on-Avon on the political thinking of Shakespeare's plays".

Really! Must we then believe that the driving of hard bargains, the making of a corner in malt, the attempt to enclose Common Lands, and lending money on security, were the main inspirations of such a play as *Coriolanus*? Far be it from us to underestimate the dollar earning value of the great modern borough of Stratford-on-Avon; but if the "political" history of that once peaceful hamlet has to be dug up and re-interpreted as a fitting background for the successful businessman-poet, surely this is going too far.

There can be no doubt of the revolutionary ideas with which *Coriolanus* is crammed. They were noted and critically examined by Delia Bacon in 1857. A most interesting paper on this question at the recent meeting at Stratford-on-Avon was read by Mr. H. J. Oliver of Sidney University. Mr. Oliver drew attention to the fact that, whereas in Plutarch Coriolanus is banished because he opposes the free distribution of a special stock of corn, Shakespeare cuts clean through this to shew the banishment as a direct result of the villainous retraction of votes that had elected the hero to the consulship. Mr. Oliver thought that all the indirect characterization in the play was really in favour of Coriolanus, while those characters who disapproved of him were shewn as worthy of contempt. In Mr. Oliver's words, "at the real crisis of the play *Coriolanus* is not in the wrong."

This criticism is of particular interest to Baconians, for it supports the view that the author's pen was in the hand of an aristocrat who could alter the story as related in Plutarch. The real theme of the play, according to Mr. Oliver, was the proper place in a "democratic or would-be democratic society of the pure aristocrat who rightly or wrongly will never compromise, and who suffers where lesser men might have survived." He thought that Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*, like his Anthony, was a far finer figure than the original in Plutarch; and that, on the evidence of the play, *Coriolanus'* contemptuous opinion of the many-headed multitude, was shewn to be not far wrong.

It is hard to believe that the money-lender of Stratford would have thus deviated from Plutarch in order to express the finer feelings of a nobleman in this predicament. This aspect of Coriolanus has been noticed before by the American poet, Mark Van Doren:

"The movement of *Coriolanus* is rhetorical, as in *Julius Cæsar*, but more bleakly than there. The streets of Rome are conceived as rostrums where men meet for the sole purpose of discussing something—the character of the hero and its effect upon a certain political situation. Shakespeare is . . . addressing himself with all the sobriety of his intelligence to a subject which has not been created by the play itself or even by its respected godfather Plutarch. It is a subject whose existence does not depend upon dramatic art, nor is the artist in this case wholly absorbed in it . . ."

Nevertheless it was a subject and situation which Francis Bacon, whose long career in the House of Commons had made him a political thinker of great insight, may well have conceived.

Mark Van Doren is equally illuminating on the play of *Julius Cæsar* and again anticipates some of the recent deliberations at Stratford:

" . . . Shakespeare idealised Plutarch's Brutus, but not in the direction of his own Henry V. The Roman conspirator has become an exemplary gentleman and the chief sign of this is his set of scruples. . ."

" . . . The accommodation of his style to an ancient and alien atmosphere is amazingly complete, and there is in *Julius Cæsar* a perfection of form which even he will never surpass. But the accommodation is something of a *tour de force*, and the perfection is of that sort which limits rather than releases poetry. *Julius Cæsar* is more rhetoric than poetry, just as its persons are more orators than men . . ."

" . . . *Julius Cæsar* is least notable amongst Shakespeare's better plays for the distinctions of its speech. All of its persons tend to talk alike; their training has been *forensic*, so that they can say anything with both efficiency and ease. . ."

Francis Bacon's Forensic indeed legal training made him an adept in this style.

These little known essays in Shakespearian criticism are mainly concerned with the inner meaning and artistic purpose of the plays. They are, therefore, free of any struggle to reconcile them with the rustic life of the XVIth century village. Mark Van Doren apprehends what Delia Bacon noticed a century ago, that the Roman plays and certain others provided the Author with a very useful platform for introducing and discussing revolutionary ideas in the days of Tudor despotism.

* * * *

We print in this issue two very interesting letters from Dr. J. Gerstenberg, Ph.D., a member who is living in Dublin. Dr. Gerstenberg supports his letter on the question of Bacon's connection with Rosicrucians by excellent photostats. At present it is impossible to reproduce these, but the original text can be verified in most Universities and Museum Libraries. One of Dr. Gerstenberg's illustrations appears as our frontispiece, and we hope to print more in our next issue.

One of the most widely-read Baconian authors, particularly among

the general public, is the late Alfred Dodd. The persuasiveness and power of his writings are consistently witnessed by the popularity of his books. Unfortunately these are now out of print, and in present circumstances the Society cannot assume the financial outlay of republishing them. We, therefore, appeal to members' generosity in giving or loaning copies to the Society, so that they can be reissued to those who are unable to obtain them. The books we have in mind particularly are the *Personal Life Story* and *Shakespeare, Creator of Freemasonry*, requests for which are numerous. Other books which are needed, and which should benefit our cause for the passing on, are *Shakespeare's Secret Sonnet-Diary*, *The Marriage of Elizabeth Tudor*, *The Martydom of Francis Bacon*. and *Shakespeare, Creator of Freemasonry*.

* * * *

We are very pleased to be able to print articles from members in the U.S.A., and Robert R. Riegle now contributes "Preparations for the New Philosophy of Francis Bacon", which helps to develop the theme originally expounded in his "*Francis Bacon: His Intellectual World and Primary Philosophy*", printed in BACONIANA, No. 145, in 1953. Mr. Riegle believes that the complete discovery of the Shakespeare Plays authorship will depend on the revelation of the new method for searching for Truth which, he claims, Bacon instituted. The present article depicts some of our contributor's views on this system and these should be of special interest to the cypherists.

We trust that Mr. Riegle will in due course allow us to present to our readers the results of further investigations into the specialised line of study he has been pursuing. Meanwhile other members will no doubt express their opinions.

* * * *

At the invitation of Columbia Pictures Corporation Limited, we attended the World Premiere of the film "Joe Macbeth". This is a free adaptation of the old play to a setting in the American underworld; and, but for the title, might well pass for a typical gangster production, with thrills enough to satisfy the most jaded appetite! However criticisms from the literary angle are beside the point. Like Punch's reviewer, we must first admit to having been genuinely entertained; the question next arises as to whether this re-attiring of Shakespeare's *dramatis personae* in modern garb is legitimate, and whether it is successful.

The promoters of this film have simply followed our Elizabethan author in stealing an old story and altering it to suit their purpose. And since we believe the Shakespeare Plays constituted Bacon's own self-declared method of "teaching without appearing as the Teacher", it does not greatly disturb us if the incognito is carried a step further, provided the inner message of the play is not lost.

This film is for the general public. The audience is not expected to be interested in how far it corresponds to the old play of *Macbeth*, but rather with its entertainment value. If, at the same time, this enables it to carry an indirect warning as to how an easy natured but

ambitious man may be worked upon to do ghastly things by an unscrupulous wife, so much the better. On this score, we believe "Joe Macbeth" has succeeded, and certainly there is a horrible but true analogy of terrorism promoted by fear in the killing of innocent children by hired "gorillas". In other respects the film is not comparable to the Play, for there is no poetic fire to burn up the excess of vice and horror.

Under such a title the classical student would no doubt expect a closer adaptation to the Play. He would seek and would find the same inter-play of cause and effect; but he would have no right to be disappointed at the exclusion of certain points and the introduction of others. These are matters for those whose business is to assess the box office returns. Playing to the gallery, even in Bacon's day, was an all important factor in diffusing new ideas by means of entertainment.

In Cambridge two years ago, we saw a Wykehamist presentation of the *Comedy of Errors* as an Edwardian musical comedy in appropriate costume. We found this delightful, and we thought that not a little charm was due to the adhering to Shakespeare's text, very clearly spoken, and to the setting of some of his loveliest lyrics to new tunes. The film "Joe Macbeth" has not these advantages. The poetic lighting with which even the dun sky of *Macbeth* is illuminated, is absent here, and one finds oneself imprisoned in the sombre atmosphere of the Chicago underworld.

Nevertheless, this film propounds a certain broad philosophy. Like the Shakespeare Play, it rightly avoids the traditional happy ending. In any case it is far less horrifying than the Mau-Mau film "Simba" which we thought was justified in placing on record some unpleasant facts of human suffering which are too easily forgotten.

We wish Columbia Pictures every success and we are grateful to them for their courtesy in asking us to view this production.

* * * *

From the half-filled auditorium of the Royal Court Theatre, we saw the last performance of "The Son of York". Although the acting of Leslie French and Valentine Dyall was an entertainment in itself, and the rest of the cast were remarkably good, it seemed a sad occasion. Why then did this well-produced play last only one month?

We believe it was a lost cause from the beginning. To enter the same field in opposition to Shakespeare's *Richard III* was a bold thing to do. The super-villain has more fascination for the theatre-goer than the saint; and within the compass of Shakespeare's imagined universe, Richard III teaches a lesson, even though the actual history of the last Plantaganet is a controversial one. Even Bacon in his *Henry VII* says that King Richard was so well loved in the North that the memory of him would die slow.

There have been many attempts to justify his reign, to prove that the murder of the young Princes in the Tower was a "frame-up", and that they were really abducted by John Moxton, Bishop of Ely in a

"misguided" effort to support Henry Tudor. It has also been suggested that one of these Princes returned later as Perkin Warbeck. But the Shakespeare vision of Richard "hunch-back" as the villain-of-the-piece is the popular one, and supported to some extent by the XVIIth century evidence of the finding of two likely skeletons. So any new play on this subject which has to rely for its appeal on carefully reasoned arguments, and which does not outshine the Shakespeare Play in entertainment value, starts with a heavy handicap.

Sometimes we receive friendly letters from members of the Society, suggesting that a play or film on Lord Bacon would be a good way of popularizing our philosophical contentions. True, we have a far greater wealth of evidence than could be adduced in favour of Richard III. But the theme is almost bound to be unpopular now, and we doubt if a theatrical producer would risk it.

* * * *

Stratford-on-Avon has become a secular shrine and, whether we like it or not, we have to admit its prodigious money-making capacity. "Ripeness is All" says Shakespeare. "The Ripeness or Unripeness of the occasion must ever be well weighed" says Bacon. Perhaps the time is not yet ripe for a show-down, and a true play on Francis Bacon would be premature. A gangster film like "Joe Macbeth", which involves no historical controversy and provides all kinds of thrills, has more chance of success, and may still impart to an unsuspecting audience the broad lesson of the Play.

Vested interests take a deal of shifting. The method of direct argument, supported by documentary evidence, can only be brought to bear upon an occasional audience willing to hear both sides of the question in lecture or debate. Theatres and cinemas must depend on filling their seats not for a single evening, but for months on end. The box-office governs them, and it is the care of the producer to "give the public what it wants". To give the public a daily dose of what it does not want requires very considerable finance.

Indirectly the art of music has been used of late in furthering our cause, without provoking opposition. Mr. Johan Franco, an American composer of merit and a staunch member of our Society, has already entered this field. We now understand that his "Virgin Queen Dream" Aria, which was performed in New York in 1953, will be repeated in "The Symphony of the Air" early in 1956. It is based on the strangely moving text assembled from many sources by Orville Owen in *The Tragical History of the Earl of Essex* (pp. 29-30). We believe our members (whether cypherists or anti-cypherists) will join with us in congratulating Mr. Johan Franco in being able to "put across" a theme of this kind to the musical world.

* * * *

We are pleased to print a short article from one of our valued French members who, while appreciating Mr. Eagle's scholastic ability, feels that the oft-quoted mistakes in Mrs. Gallup's book are not really of primary importance. There is, so he thinks, already enough concrete evidence on these matters to enable the story to go forward. On a

question upon which opinion has long been divided we welcome this brief exposition from one so well informed as Professor Pierre Henrion, whose candour reminds us of Mark Twain. Incidentally, Dr. Gerstenberg has recently drawn attention to an unusual illustration in De Larrey's "*Histoire d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse et d'Irlande*" (Rotterdam 1707), Vol. III, p.744, confirming Professor Hervion's references to a "natural" child. We hope to reproduce this illustration in our next issue; it shows Queen Elizabeth I in company with three children, two in the light, and one in the shadow. Those in the light are holding a goose quill and what appears to be a rudder, respectively; the one in the shadow is shown as struggling past a sacrificial flame towards the light. We hope to enlarge on this in the next issue.

OBITUARY

It is with deep regret that we record the death on October 15th of William Aspden, our late secretary, who for reasons of ill health was compelled to leave London for his native Wales. He gave the Society his services generously during a most difficult period of retrenchment, and was responsible for organizing the removal of our offices to a more appropriate address at Canonbury Tower.

With the passing of William Aspden many will miss the quiet voice on the microphone which broadcast from time to time in "Country Magazine". A great lover of Nature and student of Natural history, we shall like to think of him as last seen at Easter in Denbighshire, when we came upon him unexpectedly at a turn of the road. We had intended a surprise visit, but found him walking slowly with a friend, carrying a small ladder. He promised, if we should follow him, a close-up view of the tawny owl, largest of our British owls. So we fell into step and were not disappointed; but even then his health must have been failing fast.

Like Francis Bacon he combined his intense love of Nature with the desire that it should be studied in all its myriad forms "for the relief of man's estate"; so that it was characteristic of him to bequeath his body to science, to "experiment".

In thinking of William Aspden and his sanguine attitude in adversity we call to mind a phrase of Lord Bacon's which used to please him, and which also seems to find an echo in those wilds of northern Wales:

"If you listen to David's harp you shall hear as many hearselike airs as carols; And the pencil of the Holy Ghost hath laboured more in describing the afflictions of Job than the felicities of Solomon."

To the Council there was never a word of "affliction"—nothing ever resembling a hard-luck story. We, therefore, leave his memory to those of his brethren who hold him in charity, many of whom may not have realized that they were corresponding with one who, while serving our beloved Society, was slowly succumbing to an incurable malady.

M.P.

* * * *

William Aspden was a gentle-mannered, kindly man, and believed devoutly in the Baconian cause. For several years, in the face of unusual difficulties, he worked hard as our Secretary, and it was characteristic of his whole outlook that he gave far too little attention to his own failing health. Aspden's interests were widespread—he was a keen Mason, a professional ornithologist, and broadcast a number of talks for the B.B.C. on birds and books—and Council members who have been privileged to make his acquaintance will feel the gap now that he has been taken from us. It is pleasant to think that for the last months of his life he returned to study the birds he loved so well, in Anglesey.

N.F.

SECRET OF STATE

by PROFESSOR PIERRE HENRION

WITH all respect to Mr. Eagle's ability and scholarship (which so many vital contributions to BACONIANA have attested) I must confess that I did not read without amusement the conclusions he derives from his find in *The Calendar of State Papers*. Would that these State Papers were complete and candid where Queen Elizabeth I is concerned! Would that they were as clear about the parliamentary debates and Acts bearing on the succession, as they are about the Queen's activities on the day of her alleged confinement!

But let us look at this matter the other way round. A Renaissance Queen wishes to keep private some highly intimate events that would be detrimental to her professed policy if known to the general public, to foreign states and even to posterity. What is she to do? Concoct an alibi, surely. And what's simpler than to postdate or antedate the signing of an official act? If we take as a working hypothesis that Elizabeth was indeed delivered of a child that day, we are bound to look for some such trick on her part. Given her psychology, her well-known proficiency in the diplomatic art of double-dealing, the absence of such tricks would be disquieting. Even if it were recorded that she appeared in a public procession on that very day, I should take the statement *cum grano salis*, being perforce unable to verify it . . . *in situ*.

And is Bacon's lineage a question of having faith in Mrs. Gallup's tales? In my humble opinion, the mystery of her decipherments is much thicker than the mysteries of Bacon's life, but I know enough of that sort of business to conclude that it would be as childish to dismiss her work wholesale as it would be to take every word of it for Gospel truth. But that is nowadays of minor import, for Bacon and his associates (*at his level*, mostly Tudors), have left enough cross-references and cross-checks to convince the cultured man who will not confuse verisimilitude and truth.

Verisimilitude can be easily achieved by planting a few facts that will conform in appearance to the pre-ordained patterns that enable the naïve and the dreamy to judge of the validity of a situation. But truth is better served (as the founder of the experimental method well knew), by leaving records of facts which look incompatible or erroneous at first sight, but which will incite the curious and rigorous mind to look for the hidden explanation that will dissolve the incompatibility or explain away the error.

Bacon's marriage in purple—that apparent sacrilege—his appointment as a temporary regent when James was away (that insult and that injury to the Peers of the Realm), Pierre Amboise's clear pointers to his birth in the purple, a cherished word indeed, and his princely education; the scandalous use of royal crowns in certain emblem books or as sartorial patterns in certain portraits; all these are not wasted on the

man who knows what happens behind the scenes though they leave no *official* records to enlighten the simple-minded historian. I could add a curious passage, at a vital point of Shakespeare's plays, that challenges the reader to find the author's name, several times repeated.

Once you are taught to read or happen to become self-taught, you find that the answer is not Bacon (as maybe you expected) but TUDOR repeated *nine times on end*. No secret means ever devised to authenticate a note of the Bank of England is more efficient than the checking system by which the message is authenticated. It is much more valid than any apparent manuscript signature that any madman or any forger can put in the margin of a book! Let us hope that someone with more authority than I have will publish the precious message some day. Even without it, even without Mrs. Gallup's unsatisfactory decipherments, even without the intriguing inscription on the Canonbury walls, it would be unreasonable, in 1955, to deny the royal birth of Francis.

The birthday usually given need not even be correct. All sorts of tricks are resorted to by those who wish to cover tracks. Inconsistencies may be detected when assembling some pieces of the puzzle, *e.g.* the York Place/York House quibble by Rawley who should have known better; the nonplussing entry in the baptismal register at St. Martin's-in-the-fields; the Queen's alleged activity in signing state papers. But lack of information as to the exact circumstances of the birth will not affect the main issue, nor should it be allowed to confuse it. A sane man can now take the odds at a hundred to one for the Tudor parentage.

If the entry for January 22nd in *The Calendar of State Papers* was a conscious alibi, it would work wonders for minds trained to run smoothly on well-oiled logical grooves, for everyone knows that a first confinement is normally (but not necessarily) very painful, as is recalled by Mr. Eagle. But, even if it was so in the case of Elizabeth, who is to say that it was her *first* confinement? There are records of a previous one (and *they* do not specify a first-born!). There is indeed another man, older than Francis, who is secretly but unmistakably sealed as a Tudor in several places and specially in a sort of family pen-portrait where he is linked, under the common name of Tudor, to Elizabeth, Bacon and Essex. There is another record of this distinguished personage, a record which is both public and private, public in so far as anybody can see it where it is exhibited, but private in so far as it requires some slight and easy decoding before it reveals its astonishing secret. It was originally accompanied by a ritual self-proving seal of authentication which was ruthlessly defaced before the record was exhibited.

Though this cannot be ascertained for certain (as there might still be other children!), it was probably this elder son of hers that Elizabeth had in view when she directed the Parliament to nominate the *natural* issue of her body as the rightful successor to the crown ("a° XIII° Elizabeth", therefore 1571, whatever *The Calendar* says in a suspicious attempt to mislead the enquirer, however scandalous this may sound). One must be as blind as an orthodox historian not to see what that stupendous epithet *natural* implies. Who can

imagine a Parliament wantonly legislating about the issue, and what is more the *natural* issue, of a childless and ageing woman (thirty-eight was at that time a hopeless age to beget a first-born) and a formidable woman at that?

A critical study of the diffident, muddled, and probably garbled records for 1559, 1566 and 1571, shows that the unfortunate members of Parliament were as anxious to settle the question of the succession as they were scared to broach it. You can sense an almost physical fear—and who can blame them if they felt an uneasy tingling round their necks? And while they could have taken the easy solution of letting the matter drop, they went as far as discussing a *natural* issue to the Queen's body in 1571! There is only one conclusion for a free mind: the Queen *had* natural offspring. It is the only hypothesis that will cover all the facts—and that is why historians are so little prone to mention this (to them), unexplainable legal mention of the "natural issue".

In 1559 an Act had recognized as "of the blood royal of the realm of England" "the heirs of your body *lawfully to be begotten*". Both the adverb and the future tense (implied in *to be begotten*) excluded the dearly loved natural child that I mentioned above. In 1571 the same words would still have excluded him, *but not Francis* if he had been "lawfully begotten", which I take to mean begotten in religiously celebrated wedlock, an intimate celebration making no difference. So now the natural child was doubly in difficulty and a change to "*natural issue*" was imperative if the Queen wanted the elder half-brother to be preferred to Francis. I never understood the curious change in epithets until the existence of a natural child was revealed to me. Then everything fitted perfectly. The 1559 formula was necessary to discard him, as the Privy Council hardly found him suitable. Then the change in phraseology was necessary in 1571 to reinstate the favourite child in preference to the lawful son born in the meantime. In 1571 Elizabeth was powerful enough to have her way with the Privy Council and therefore with the Parliament.

Were the members of Parliament fully aware of what they were doing? They probably suspected it, to say the least. Were they content? Probably not, since although Elizabeth dared any objector "to come to the Privy Council" no one availed himself of the kind offer.

In our century, when press and public have a right to pry into their private affairs, if need be with long-range cameras, the great have to make a hard choice when their private inclinations come into conflict with their official role. It was not so in the XVIth century. It was then comparatively easy to act a double part—on one side as the unassailable hero entirely devoted to the welfare of the nation, and on the other as a private individual open to the frailties that are the lot of flesh. Apart from statesmen sworn to professional secrecy who knew better than to infringe it, any subject who made bold to refer to such secrets of state was, for the first offence, to "suffer imprisonment of one whole year and forfeit half his goods", as was expressly recalled concerning the succession. For the cost of subsequent offences, would-be

offenders and their abettors were referred to the ill-boding Statute of Provision or *Praemunire*.

Now if representatives of the public fancied that they were privileged as such to have their say, Her Majesty ordered her Lord Keeper to remind them that

“they should do well to meddle with no matters of state but such as should be propounded unto them, and to occupy themselves with other matters concerning the Commonwealth” (1571, again referring to the succession).

One understands, after that, the contemporaries' unwillingness to leave us open information about the Queen's matrimonial secrets! The Commons' Journal reports that a similar order to stop *meddling* “was taken of all the House most joyfully with most hearty prayers and thanks for the same.”

And all that smoke without a fire!

All the same, I sympathise with Mr. Eagle's feelings. When one has reached the solution of the literary mystery regarding Shakespeare, one is loath to go further; one has, as it were, supped full of wonders. Personally, I should have been content to stop at that; but, if I may paraphrase Browning, in the quest for Baconian truth the journey is never done and the (pyramidal) summit never attained—yet the strong man must go on!

After the literary secret, you reach the family secrets (a cupboardful of them) and then, with bated breath and awed countenance, the Secret of State, so devastating that it is still protected after nearly four centuries, by a conspiracy the very idea of which is repellent to the incredulous modern mind. Then you notice that the New English Dictionary, under the aegis (understand the auspices, I would never mean Pallas' shield!) of a very official learned society, forgets to give Shakespeare his ample due as regards a specifically Cantabrigian sense of *to keep*. Then you notice that a mysteriously inspired Press, otherwise bent on sensation-hunting, turns down certain letters to the Editor, while B.B.C. microphones tend to be one-sided; then that some documentary evidence too much in the public eye gets tampered with or runs away from you; that certain documents suddenly desert their time-honoured pressmarks; that under fallacious pretexts a motion in Parliament bearing “a° XIII° Elizabeth” is presented as “an elaborate paper” whose date is “presumed” (!!) not to be true by the eclectic *Calendar of State Papers*; that a very good painting by a great painter is never exhibited even in the most comprehensive international exhibitions of the said painter, and that it is never reproduced though the tale it tells brightly to the observing eye deserves better publicity; that certain official quarters have sedulously avoided, until very recently, recognising officially the Stratford idol, which means several centuries of scrupulous honesty; that—but let me stop here. And you wonder who these bright, slick conspirators might be who work thus undetected in a world of publicity. But one day everything dovetails in your mind and it does not matter much to you if Mrs. Gallup's decoding is correct or not, for you have enough material without her.

A PIONEER

III

by M.P.

DELIA BACON attributed the extraordinary outpouring of Elizabethan and Jacobean literature to a group of worthy men of whom Francis Bacon became the chief. In its earlier phases this movement towards enlightenment and "the relief of man's estate" had been sustained by such men as Michel de Montaigne, Sir Philip Sidney, and later by Sir Walter Raleigh. The frequent references to Montaigne in Bacon's English works and the fact that Anthony Bacon lived in France with him for a considerable time, lend support to this view.

In France, the renaissance of letters had slightly preceded ours, being largely the work of a group calling itself "Les Pléiades", of whom Ronsard, Du Bellay and Jodelle were members. Their works had included the development and enrichment of the French language, but the first great original work of the new philosophy—the philosophy of opening of men's eyes "obliquely"—was the famous book of essays by the Gascon philosopher. According to Delia Bacon this was one of the earliest productions of a secret school in which a scientific plan was concealed under a gay and popular "art of delivery". Ostensibly the book aimed to be popular in form, but it was so interwoven with latent meanings, that it was hard to see how it could have been read at all without occasioning the inquiry which it was so important to avoid.

In Montaigne one finds bold anecdotes and vivid illustrations brought in with superb irrelevance. Yet the author, in one of those "nooks of discourse", which he is never at a loss to create when the purpose of his *essai* requires it, actually beckons the reader aside to explain his method . . .

"Neither these stories, nor my allegations do always serve simply for example, authority, or ornament. I do not only record them for the use I make of them; they carry sometimes (besides what I apply them to) the seeds of richer and bolder matter—and sometimes, collaterally a more delicate sound—both to me myself and to others who happen to be of my ear."

Of Montaigne's "delicate and collateral sound" Delia Bacon has much to say. It chiefly concerned those who happen to be of his "ear", as the author himself made clear . . .

"I write my book for few men and few years. Had it been a matter of duration, I should have put it into a better language . . . Who can expect that the present form of language should be in use fifty years hence? . . . We say that it is now perfect; every age says the same of the language it speaks; I shall hardly trust to that so long as it runs away and changes as it does . . . It is for good and useful writings to nail and

rivet it to them, and its reputation will go according to the fortune of our state. For which reason I am not afraid to insert herein several private articles that concern the particular knowledge of some, who will see further into them than the common reader . . ."

We know who held similar views on the transience of modern languages—who took steps to have the living body of his philosophy preserved and embalmed in the Latin tongue—who thought these modern languages would "play the bankrupt with books", and who seems to have underestimated the latent vitality of the language he was then forging in his works of "recreation"—those "*works of the Alphabet*" which he kept sending to Sir Toby Matthew. Concerning the identity of these Spedding is at a loss, for there is no other clue save a chance phrase in Bacon's own hand-writing "*tragedies and comedies are made of one alphabet.*"¹

But to return to Montaigne. It seems that, apart from the "few men" for whom he wrote he expected posterity would mis-judge him . . .

"Now as much as decency permits, I here discover my inclinations and affections. If any observe he will find that I have either told, or designed to tell ALL. What I cannot express I point out with my finger.

It was reserved for the author of the "Shake-speare" Plays, by fathering revolutionary ideas on *imaginary* historical characters, to point with an even longer finger at what he could not openly express.

Delia Bacon quotes passages from Montaigne expressing a truth which she regards as a "last vintage of the *Novum Organum*", and which in a profound way, link the Gascon philosopher with Bacon and Shakespeare . . .

"Nothing presses so hard upon a State as Innovation . . . to undertake to found so great a mass anew, and to change the foundations of so vast a building, is for them to do who . . . would reform particular defects by a universal confusion, and cure diseases by death."

(Montaigne)

"It were good therefore, that Men in their Innovations would follow the example of Time itself; which indeed innovateth greatly, but quietly and by degrees . . ."

(Bacon)

"The world is unapt for curing itself; it is so impatient of anything that presses it, that it thinks of nothing but disengaging itself, at what price soever. We see, by a thousand examples that it generally cures itself to its cost. The discharge of a present evil is no cure, if a general amendment of condition does not follow; the surgeon's end is not only to cut away the dead flesh—that is but progress of his cure;—he has a care over and above, to fill up the wound with better and more natural flesh, and to restore the member to its due state. Whoever only proposed to himself to remove that which offends him falls short; for good does not necessarily succeed evil; another evil may succeed, and a

¹*Promus*, Entry 516, British Museum.

worse, as it happened in Caesar's killers, who brought the republic to such a pass, that they had reason to repent their meddling with it!"

(Montaigne)

"I fear there will a worse one come in his place"

Julius Cæsar

"Domestic fury and fierce civil strife
shall circle all the parts of Italy" (*ibid.*)

These writers, Montaigne, Bacon and the "author" of the Shakespeare folio, were clearly of one mind in many things. Whatever we may think about Shakespeare, we must admit that Delia Bacon had good grounds for her belief that a new philosophical plan was then in the making, and that it was sponsored by a certain group of authors, among the first of whom was that "idle, tattling, rambling old Gascon", from whose outlandish, irrelevant yet profound criticisms our present "Spectators" and "Tatlers"—together with many other "monthlies" and "quarterlies"—trace their descent.

(to be continued)

BOOK REVIEW

A Short History of the Stratford "Shakespeare" Monument by
EDWARD D. JOHNSON, Price 1/-.

The President of the Francis Bacon Society has now published a further brochure running to fifteen pages only, but excellently produced, and including five valuable illustrations of the original and extant Monuments. The Stratfordian claim that the present Bust is the "first monument to Shakespeare ever to be erected" is shown by the author to be false. The arguments to support Mr. Johnson's case are carefully marshalled and even to the non-legal mind convincing, but it is a pity that several errors have remained undetected.

On page three the 29 buttons mentioned are on the *present* figure, and the 14 on Dugdale's Bust, not *vice versa*, and again on page 15, where the Simple Cypher count of Francis Bacon is neatly extracted from the inscription under the Monument, the numbers of B, and A, are inadvertently reversed.

These blemishes, and one or two misprints, do not materially affect the fluency of the argument, although no one knows who was responsible for erecting the first Bust which fell into disrepair by the 1740's. It is significant, however, that this sculpture boasted a number of Masonic or Rosicrucian devices, including a reversed sleeve like that in the Droeshout engraving in the Shakespeare First Folio, a spade and an hour-glass, and other emblems which in themselves seem to indicate the unseen influence of Francis Bacon. The new Bust, shows a man with, in the words of Mark Twain, "The deep, deep, deep, subtle, subtle, subtle, expression of a bladder." Mr. Johnson does well to remind us of the mysterious story of the Stratford Monuments, and we readily recommend a purchase of this booklet for our Members' own perusal, and for passing on to their friends.

N.F.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE NEW PHILOSOPHY OF FRANCIS BACON

by ROBERT R. RIEGLE

BEFORE the neophyte may enter the inner temples of a secret society and participate in its formal rites, he must pass the tests and ordeals set before him. He must prepare himself to cope with and fulfil the obligations and regulations with which he will be confronted. So it is with us in our endeavours to discover Bacon's New Philosophy. Before we may enter those secret hidden temples of learning where the sublime mind is happily married to the truth of Nature, the arduous task of preparation must be completed. This preparation consists primarily of two parts (a) the correction of the imperfections of the senses, (b) the correction of the imperfections of the intellect. The senses and the intellect are the means by which knowledge increases. If these are at fault, the knowledge that is received may be erroneous. The senses are the door to the intellect, and, since they are imperfect, it is necessary to provide instruments to correct the imperfections. The eye, for example, fails to observe bodies extremely small or invisible or at extreme distances. To correct the errors of the sight one must employ various kinds of optical instruments. We are limited in our reasoning to using the intellect. But the intellect itself is defective. It produces false ideas which Bacon calls the "Idols of the Mind." It distorts the true images of nature. The intellect must be trained to overcome these "Idols of the Mind". The intellect must be prepared before it can receive the true images of nature. This preparation and training require the use of many experiments. Instruments to correct the imperfections of the senses and experiments to fortify the intellect against its defects. These are the pathways to the true images of nature, to the "divine ideas".

Since experiments require material to work upon, it is necessary to produce this material. In a previous article I stated that Bacon had created a world of his own and that the matter or material or nature of this world was the paper and ink that were used in the production of his philosophical works. Let us now create a situation that involves all three: — instruments, matter, and experiments. The instrument employed is a double convex lens of approximately ten power magnification. An ordinary reading glass has insufficient power. I am quite aware that the lens employed is not the true instrument, but it is adequate enough to observe latent configurations and then one's curiosity should be sufficiently aroused to want to experiment to find the proper instruments. The material employed is the printed matter in Stanton's facsimile of the *Folio Edition of Shakespeare's Plays*, 1623.

Our next task is to elevate the condition of the mind, to train it against those inherent false ideas which occupy it. Let us acquaint ourselves with some of the "Idols of the Tribe" which have their foundation in human nature itself. "The human understanding is moved by those things most which strike and enter the mind simultaneously and suddenly, and so fill the imagination; and then it feigns and supposes all other things to be somehow, though it can't see how, similar to those few things by which it is surrounded." (*Novum Organum* Book I, Aph.)

"The human understanding is unquiet; it cannot stop or rest, and still presses onward, but in vain . . . The like subtlety arises touching the infinite divisibility of lines, from the same inability of thought to stop". (*ibid* I)

"The human understanding is no dry light, but receives an infusion from the will and affections; whence proceed sciences which may be called 'sciences as one would'. For what a man had rather were true he more readily believes". (*ibid* I).

"... but by far the greatest hindrance and aberration of the human understanding proceeds from the dullness, incompetency, and deception of the senses, in that things which strike the sense outweigh things which do not immediately strike it, though they be more important. Hence, it is that speculation commonly ceases where sight ceases; inasmuch that of things invisible there is little or no observation. Hence, all the working of the spirits inclosed in tangible bodies lies hid and unobserved of men. So also all the more subtle changes of form in the parts of coarser substances is in like manner unobserved. And yet unless these two things just mentioned be searched out and brought to light, nothing great can be achieved in nature, as far as the production of works is concerned". (*ibid* I)

"The human understanding is of its own nature prone to abstractions and gives a substance and reality to things which are fleeting. But to resolve nature into abstractions is less to our purpose than to dissect her into parts. Matter rather than forms should be the object of our attention, its configurations and changes of configuration and simple action and law of action or motion". (*ibid* I)

Since it would be an extremely lengthy task to discuss the merits of all the printed matter found in the Folio of 1623, I have limited my study to the question marks which vary in number from approximately one hundred and fifty in *The Tempest* to about five hundred and fifty in *Othello*. The first time that I read the plays, my sense of sight being subject to error did not discover anything unusual about the question marks. Because the mind was preoccupied with the plot of the play, it took for granted that all marks at the ends of the questions were constructed in the same manner and form. Upon reading the plays for the second time, I became aware of the repetition of many questions, such as, "What's heere?" "What's there?" "What's this?" "What's that?" "What is the matter?" "What is it?" "Who's there?" "Who is this?" "What make you heere?" etc. Since some of these questions seemed irrelevant to the dialogue, my curiosity was aroused; so I

examined the question marks after such questions as stated above and found to my amazement that they were broken up into various parts—many of them varied in construction and made up of different elements that appeared to be some kind of characters. To determine whether these characters were prevalent in the question marks throughout the plays, I decided to tabulate fifty from each play making a total of approximately seventeen hundred question marks. From this tabulation I found the following characters to be quite plentiful:

Lines slanted from right to left
 Lines slanted from left to right
 Short and long perpendicular lines
 Short horizontal lines
 Half circles with openings toward the top
 Half circles with openings toward the bottom
 Half circles with openings towards the right
 Half circles with openings towards the left
 Quarter circles with openings the same as the half circles
 Light dots, heavy dots, and solid semi-circles.

Sometimes these characters were very heavy, while at other times they were light. Other characters were found, but it would lengthen the article too much to describe them. I hope, however, that I have described sufficient characters to arouse your curiosity enough to look for yourself. These same characters are found in the individual letters throughout The Folio of 1623, as well as in Bacon's *Sylva Sylvarum* 7th edition 1658. It appears to me that these characters are the elements which make up some form of stenographic writing. To discover and interpret their true values would be an excellent project for the members of the Francis Bacon Society, for it would be next to impossible for one person to complete such an undertaking. But let us not be hasty in our experiments. Let us heed Bacon's warning that "the human understanding is unquiet; it cannot stop or rest, and still presses onward".

"And even when men seek to educe some science or theory from their experiments, they nevertheless almost always turn aside with over-hasty and unseasonable eagerness to practice; not only for the sake of the uses and fruits of practice, but from the impatience to obtain in the shape of some new work an assurance for themselves that it is worth their while to go on; and also to show themselves off to the world, and so raise the credit of the business in which they are engaged. Thus, like Atalanta, they go aside to pick up the golden apple, but meanwhile, they interrupt their course, and let the victory escape them *Novum Organum*."

In the *Advancement of Learning* Bacon says, "So it cometh often to pass that mean and small things discover great better than great can discover small; and, therefore, Aristotle noteth well that the nature of everything is best seen in his smallest portions".

Let us follow the directions of Bacon, the instructor. Let us,

therefore, pause at these question marks and dissect the nature of them. As we examine each one of the seventeen hundred question marks, plus many more that were not tabulated, with the optical instrument, we can discover in many of them small figures, letters, and other characters that are invisible to the naked eye. But they can be observed only by pausing and scrutinizing very steadily and patiently. If we pause and observe the lines that form the margins of the pages, we can see that they are divisible and that at the divisions are found the same latent configurations. The only way that all of these small configurations, as well as other latent configurations, can be discovered and tabulated is by first developing the proper optical instruments by which they can be clearly identified. (With the kind permission of the Editor, I should like to submit for publication in some future issue of *BACONIANA* my theory of the construction of the lenses to be used.) It can be truly said that mankind in general is self-willed and infuses his will into his understanding. Bacon tells us that we must humble ourselves to the Will of God if we wish to discover God's secrets of nature. If we are to discover the secrets of the nature Bacon adopted for his world, we are compelled to subjugate our wills to the will of Bacon. Know thyself, prepare thyself, regulate thyself, are the watchwords of many great writers before Bacon. All had for their goal the development of the individual. The defects and failings in society are caused by the imperfections in ourselves. To get rid of them appears a fruitless task. Bacon declared that he was going in the same way as the ancients, but he transcends them in his method of voyaging. How can man accept a new philosophy if he is enslaved to the false reasonings of his mind? When he has liberated himself from the bondages of too much freedom of thought, when he has learned to subjugate his will to the will of Bacon, when he has learned to discipline his mind to receive the true images of things rather than false notions, then he will be prepared to receive Bacon's New Philosophy.

"The formation of ideas and axioms by true induction is no doubt the proper remedy to be applied for the keeping off and the clearing away of idols. To point them out, however, is of great use; for the doctrine of Idols is to the Interpretation of Nature what the doctrine of the refutation of Sophisms is to Common logic." *Novum Organum*. From the above quotation we can readily see that Bacon laid great importance upon the clearing of the mind of these Idols. Since he laid so much importance upon them, it appears to me that our first important step is to study them carefully and attempt to apply them.

To his Intellectual World, Bacon joined a primitive or primary philosophy, the purposes of which were to discipline the mind and correct the errors of the senses. The configurations of the matter used in his World are the elements that make up many kinds of alphabets for the transmission of knowledge. When we have discovered and tabulated all the elements that make up the Abecedarium of Bacon's Nature, and have learned to interpret his Nature, I believe that we shall be in a position to learn how far along the course of his New Philosophy Bacon had travelled.

Those who have taken it upon themselves to assert that Francis Bacon never completed his new method of searching for the truth have done both Bacon and his philosophy a great injury. For as they have been successful in inducing disbelief, so they have been effective in suppressing and stopping inquiry. Since these writers have failed in their endeavours to discover his new method, it appears to me that we cannot learn from them; therefore, I believe that it is necessary for those of us who believe that Bacon's philosophy is yet to come to lay aside the authorities on Bacon and begin our search anew by having only one authority—Bacon. This cannot be done by making a comparison with other philosophical systems, nor can it be done by studying condensations and extractions from Bacon's work. We must begin at the beginning. We must search through all of his philosophical writings, looking for clues that will lead us to our ultimate goal.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—We would refer those who may think it incredible that Francis Bacon should have used a pointed microscopic cypher to W. R. Newbold's treatise on "The Cypher of Roger Bacon" (University of Pennsylvania Press, and the Oxford University Press, 1928). Apparently Roger Bacon, in the XIIIth century, concealed microscopic characters in his MSS.; but whether the printing presses of the XVIIth century could have used this method, without betraying the secret, is a debatable point.

THOMAS TENISON (1636-1715) and his 'BACONIANA'

by F. J. A. BUNNETT

PERHAPS because Swift, who had private reasons for his dislike called him, "a dull man, who had a horror of anything like levity in the clergy, especially of whist," and James II also dubbed him "that dull man," Thomas Tenison has received less credit than he undoubtedly deserves for his farsightedness and enterprise. Yet Evelyn, his intimate friend, could say of him, that he was, "of an exemplary holy life, took great pains in constantly preaching, and incessantly employing himself to promote the service of God both in public and private. I never knew a man of more universal and generous spirit, with so much modesty, prudence and piety."¹ Dr. Gibson, Bishop of London, spoke of Tenison as, "the wisest and best man I know in the world."

Being early in their confidence, Tenison readily supported the party which was planning the accession of William and Mary to the throne. In his 'Diary' (10th August, 1688) Evelyn remarks: "Dr. Tenison now told me there would suddenly be some great thing discovered. This was the Prince of Orange intending to come over."¹

During the reign of Anne, the Archbishop—he had been appointed to the see of Canterbury in 1695—was in correspondence with the Electress Sophia urging her to come to England, and he was regarded as a leading advocate of the Hanoverian succession. Though then in failing health, he welcomed George I on his arrival in his kingdom, and performed the coronation ceremony; he had also crowned Queen Anne, with whom Tenison was no favourite, possibly in consequence of his Hanoverian proclivities.

* * * * *

Coming from a clerical family, Thomas Tenison was born at Cottenham, Cambs.,² on 29th September, 1636. His father, John Tenison, who died in 1671, was curate of the village and later rector of Mundesley, Norfolk, and in 1641 of Topcroft also, until ejected under the Commonwealth from the former. He seems to have remained undisturbed in the latter, to which was added Bracon Ash in 1662. Thomas' mother was a native of Cottenham village.

The boy's schooldays were spent in Norfolk, firstly at the Paston Grammar School, North Walsham, and secondly at Norwich Grammar School, from whence he proceeded in 1653 to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, as an Archbishop Parker scholar. There at first he studied

¹*Diary*, 19th July, 1691.

²Cottenham is also associated with Pepys. "I met Roger Pepys newly come out of the country; in discourse he told me that his grandfather, my great grandfather, had 800*l.* per annum in Queen Elizabeth's time in the very town of Cottenham."—*Diary*, 12th June, 1667.

Again: "Roger Pepys told me, that when I come to his house, he will show me a decree in Chancery, wherein there was 26 men all house-keepers in the town of Cottenham in Queen Elizabeth's time, of our name."—16th June, 1667.

medicine. A conscientious rather than a brilliant student, he graduated B.A. four years later. In 1659 Thomas Tenison was ordained at Richmond by Brian Duppa, Bishop of Salisbury, who had been a great friend of Charles I, and the same year was elected to a Norwich fellowship at his college. In 1665, besides being appointed University Reader, the still young cleric became Vicar of St. Andrew-the-Great in Cambridge. This was the year of the Plague, and the History of the College tells us that, "None ventured to continue here but Mr. Tenison, two scholars and a few servants, for whom a preservative powder was brought and administered in wine, whilst charcoal, pitch and brimstone were kept continually burning in the gatehouse. Tenison not only resided here, but what is very extraordinary, attended upon the care of St. Andrew's with perfect safety to himself during the whole time." Dull he may have been, but he was certainly possessed of courage, and to mark their high appreciation of their rector's conduct, his parishioners presented him with a handsome piece of plate.

In 1672 Tenison was made a Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the King, and held several livings, amongst them, for eighteen months, 1673-4, as Upper-Minister, that of St. Peter Mancroft, the notable Parish Church of Norwich, in the sacristy of which his portrait still hangs. He was acquainted with Sir Thomas Browne, the famous physician of Norwich, and the author of *Religio Medici*, etc., who is buried in this church. After Browne's death in 1682, Tenison edited his friend's *Certain Miscellaneous Tracts*.

He had a particular admiration for Francis Bacon, and four years previously had published his *Baconiana*, wherein he says in the preface: "Easie it is to add to things already invented, but to invent, and to do it under Discouragement, when the world is prejudiced against the Invention, and with loud Clamour hooteth at the Projector, this is not an undertaking for Dulness or Cowardice."

All honour to the author, feeling as it seems he did, in defending the memory of Bacon and in confronting a mass of unwitting prejudice. Tenison always persisted in taking what appeared to him to be the right course regardless of consequences. At the same time he published a *Discourse on Idolatry* and during his life produced numerous pamphlets, and engaged in political controversy. On 5th November, 1680, Evelyn heard Tenison preach; he was now vicar of St. Martin's, London,¹ to which living he had been presented by Charles II. He had already graduated M.A., and B.D., and the same year (1680) obtained the degree of D.D. The close friendship between the pair dates from this time and the diarist records—"the pains he takes and care of his Parish will, I fear wear him out, which would be an inexpressible loss."

Under the date 15th February 1684, Evelyn writes: "Dr. Tenisonn communicated to me his intention of erecting a library in St. Martin's parish, for the public use, and desired my assistance, with Sir Christopher Wren, about the placing and structure thereof, a worthy and

¹Not the present church: this was not built until 1722-6 by James Gibbs.

laudable design. He told me there were thirty or forty young men in Orders in his parish, either governors to young gentlemen or chaplains to noblemen, who being reproved by him on occasion for frequenting taverns or coffee-houses, told him they would study or employ their time better, if they had books. This put the pious Doctor on this design, and indeed a great reproach it is that so great a city as London should not have a public library becoming it. There ought to be one at St. Paul's; the west end of that church (if ever finished) would be a convenient place." The Library was actually founded in Castle Street, Leicester Square, in that year. On 15th February, 1685, Evelyn relates: "Dr. Tenison preached to the Household. The second sermon should have been before the King; (James II: Charles II had died nine days previously) but he, to the great grief of his subjects, did now, for the first time, go to mass publicly in the little Oratory at the Duke's lodgings, the doors being set wide open." From 1686-92 Tenison was also Minister of the new church of St. James' Place where the diarist also heard him preach on Good Friday, 1688, "on 1 Cor. xvi. 22, upon the infinite love of God to us, which he illustrated in many instances."

Tenison ministered at the bedside of Edward Turbeville, the notorious informer, as he lay dying of small-pox. He was called in to pray with the eccentric Thomas Thynne of Longleat Hall, Wilts., who was fatally injured by a rival, when driving down Pall Mall. It is said in revenge for and on behalf of a young lady, whom he had seduced under a promise of marriage and had deserted. Tenison also attended the luckless Duke of Monmouth to the scaffold on 15th July, 1685, in company with the Bishops of Ely, and Bath and Wells. He was sent for by Nell Gwyn during her last hours in 1687, preached her funeral sermon, described her as penitent, and what is more saw to the carrying out of her bequests.

A curious thing happened, Evelyn tells us, on Good Friday 25th March, 1687, during service at St. Martin's, when the Vicar preached on 1 Peter ii. 24. "A man came into near the middle of the church, with his sword drawn, with several others in that posture; in this jealous time it put the congregation into great confusion; but it appeared to be one who fled for sanctuary, being pursued by bailiffs."

7th October, 1688. "Dr. Tenison preached at St. Martin's on 2 Timothy iii. 16, showing the Scriptures to be our only rule of faith, and its perfection above all traditions. After which, near 1,000 devout persons partook of the Communion. The sermon was occasioned by a Jesuit, who in the Mass-house on the Sunday before had disparaged the Scripture and railed at our translation, which some present contradicting, they pulled him out of the pulpit, and treated him very coarsely, insomuch that it was like to create a great disturbance in the City."

Tenison, with an annual income of nearly £1,000, was now able to keep several curates, and to indulge in his two great interests, books and education. Four of his schools still flourish—the famous Archbishop Tenison's Grammar School, which moved in 1928 from Leicester Square to Kennington, a girls' school at Lambeth, and two church schools at Croydon.

His next preferment was to the Archdeaconry of London in 1689 by the new king and queen; four years later, on the nomination of Queen Mary, he was elected Bishop of Lincoln, and in 1695, on the death of Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury, being chosen instead of Stillingfleet as, "less high in his notions" and "more robust in health." Evelyn notes, 9th December: "I had news that my dear and worthy friend, Dr. Tenison, Bishop of Lincoln, was made Archbishop of Canterbury, for which I thank God and rejoice, he being most worthy of it, for his learning, piety, and prudence."

On 28th of the month the Queen died of small-pox; the new Archbishop attended her death bed and preached her funeral sermon.

He had for some time been conspicuous for his moderate attitude towards dissenters, and in consequence his appointment was far from popular amongst the high-church clergy. It was said that he was, "even more honoured and respected by the dissenters than by many in the established church." Tenison took a lively interest in missionary work overseas, and was the first president in 1701 of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, which had been founded under the Archbishop's direct encouragement by Thomas Bray. He presided over fifty-three meetings, which were held until 1833 in Tenison's Library at St. Martin's.

During the latter years of Anne's reign, he never appeared at Court, but was the first of the justices appointed by George I on his arrival in England. His last public act was to issue in 1715 a Declaration, signed also by thirteen of the bishops, testifying their abhorrence of rebellion, in which was stressed the danger which would arise to the church from the accession of a popish prince.

He had married in 1667, Anne daughter of Richard Lane, Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Dean of Ely. She died in 1714, to be followed the next year by her husband. He left very careful instructions for the avoidance of any ceremony at his interment: "I have always had an aversion to funeral pomp," he averred. His body accordingly, under the parish pall, was borne by twelve bearers from Lambeth Palace, preceded by his son, and followed only by the Mistress and twelve girls of his charity school, by his devoted friend, Dr. Gibson, Bishop of London, and two curates. Without any sermon or oration, the Archbishop was buried in the chancel of Lambeth Church in the same vault with his wife. He had given away during his lifetime most of his fortune, and his final bequests were to public charities and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

* * * * *

After Rawley's¹ death, Archbishop Tenison, at all times a great admirer of Bacon obtained many of the papers pertaining to his work,

¹Rawley, William, was intimately associated with Bacon during the most active period of his life. Becoming a Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, he first met Bacon about 1612, and later became his private chaplain; made a Doctor of Divinity in 1621, from this time he became Bacon's active assistant in the preparation and publication (writing many of the prefaces and dedications) of some of his most notable works. In 1657 Rawley published his *Resuscitatio* which included a Life of Bacon.

and from these, in 1679, he published an octavo volume, dividing it into five parts.

The book is preceded by a portrait of Bacon, and the title-page runs as follows: "Baconiana or Certain Genuine Remains of Sir Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, and Viscount of St. Albans, In Arguments Civil and Moral, Natural, Medical, Theological, and Biographical; now the First time faithfully Published." "An Account of these Remains and of all his Lordship's other Works is given by the Publisher in a Discourse by way of Introduction. London. Printed by J.D. for Richard Chiswell at the Rose and Crown in St. Paul's Churchyard, 1679."

Introduction. "Remains were put into my hands. Something done by his Lordship himself: something further added by Rev. Mr. Rawley:" "but their Remarks lay scattered in divers Places. Here they are put under one View and have received very ample Enlargements."

The book begins with his "*Lordship's Praise*". Amongst other things the author says:

"There has not arisen a more Eminent Person than the Lord High Chancellor Bacon."

"Many memorable advancers of Philosophical Knowledge lived in part of the last and this Century;" but Bacon "may seem to excel them all."

"In those days when he began his studies, Aristotle was in effect the Pope of Philosophy;" and though Bacon disliked the physiology of Aristotle, "yet he did not despise him with that Pride and Haughtiness with which youth is wont to be puffed up."¹

"Lord Verulam stood on the old Paths and perceived the unsoundness of their Bottom, their intricate windings, their tendency to a useless End, or rather the endless Disputes . . . and he looked attentively round about him, and he espied a new, and better, and larger."

Only one man "undervalued his Lordship's method—the same man who hath libell'd the Holy Scriptures, themselves. The Infidel, Spinoza."²

He was not without "Infirmities, Intellectual or Moral." "And no man, great in wit, and high in Office, can live free from suspicion of both kinds of Errors." "But whatsoever his Errors were or the cancer of his Misfortunes, they are overbalanced by his Virtues, and will die with time."

Then Tenison goes on to describe Bacon's *Mechanical Inventions*:

1. An Engine representing the Motions of the Planets.
2. A Philosophical Glass to know the season of every Hour of the Year.
3. A kind of Mechanical Index of the Mind.

The next portion is "Concerning his Works":

"*Temporis partum Maximum*" "This was a kind of embryo of the

¹Bacon had described the philosophy of Aristotle as "barren for the production of works for the benefit and use of man."

²*De Spinoza Benedict or Baruch* (1632-77) born in Amsterdam.

'Instauratio', and if it had been preserved it might have delighted and profited philosophical readers who could then have seen the generation of that great work, as it were, from the first egg of it, and by reference to the tract it will be seen that it was sound judgment."¹

Advancement of Learning. "The fairest and most correct Edition was in Latin, folio, printed at London 1623, and whosoever would understand the Lord Bacon's Cypher, let him consult that accurate Edition."²

"Three copies of 'Organum' sent to Sir H. Wotton, one who took a pride in a certain congeniality with his Lordship's studies."³

After remarking, "He intended to finish the 'New Atlantis' by adding to it a frame of Laws, or a kind of Utopian Commonwealth, but was diverted by a desire of Collecting the Natural History," Tenison goes through all the various parts of the 'Instauratio Magna.'

Of Bacon the historian he says—

"*Historie of the Raigne of King Henry VII.*" "An history which required such a Reporter those Times being Times both of great Revolution and Settlement through the Division and Union of the Roses."⁴

The fragment of "The History of Henry the Eighth" was "but one morning's work."⁵

"The Apophthegms⁶ New and Old" "were what he saith also of his

¹This fragmentary treatise Bacon alludes to in a letter to Father Fulgentio. Spedding says, "This is probably the work of which Henry Cuffe (the great Oxford scholar, who was executed in 1601 as one of the chief accomplices in the Earl of Essex's treason) was speaking, when he said that, 'a fool could not have written it, and a wise man would not!'"

²"The Two Bookes of Francis Bacon of the proficience and advancement of Learning, divine and humane"—dedicated to the King and the forerunner of the *De Augmentis* was published as a small quarto of 118 leaves in 1605.

³On receipt of these volumes Wotton wrote—"I have by the care of my cousin Mr. Thomas Meautys, and by your own special favour, three copies of that work wherewith your lordship hath done a great and ever-living benefit to all the children of nature, and to nature herself in her uttermost extent of latitude; or never before had so noble nor so true an interpreter, or (as I am readie to style your lordship) never so inward a secretary of her cabinet . . ."

Specimens of Bacon's poetry were found among Wotton's papers after his death in 1639, and were subsequently published in the *Reliquiae Wottonianae* in 1651. The *Novum Organum*—Part II of the *Instauratio Magna* was first published in Latin in 1620.

Sir Henry Wotton (1568-1639), diplomatist and poet, became in 1595 secretary to the Earl of Essex, who employed him abroad, and after holding various diplomatic appointments he was recalled from Venice and made Provost of Eton in 1624. Two of Wotton's poems have found a permanent place in Elizabethan verse: "The Character of a Happy Life", and "On his Mistress, the Queen of Bohemia."

⁴Published in April, 1622, with a most elaborately symbolical title-page, and dedicated to Charles, Prince of Wales.

⁵Published by Dr. Rawley in 1629 in "Certain Miscellany Works of the Right Hon. Francis Verulam, Viscount St. Alban."

⁶Published in a small duodecimo edition in 1658. This contained only 184 'Apophthegms' by Bacon, and was entitled, "Witty Apophthegms delivered at several times, and upon occasions by King James, King Charles, the Marquis of Worcester, Francis Lord Bacon, and Sir Thomas Moore."

Essays but as the Recreation of his other studies. They were dictated one morning out of his memory, and if they seem to any a Birth too inconsiderable for the Brain of so great a man, they may think with themselves how little a time he went with it, and from thence make some allowance."

Tenison further remarks—"His Lordship hath received much injury by late editions of which some have much enlarged, but not at all enriched, the collection; stuffing it with tales and sayings too infacetious for a ploughman's chimney corner, and particularly in the collection not long since published . . . for besides the addition of insipid tales, there are some put in which are beastly and immoral; such as were fitter to have been joined to Aretine¹ or Aloysia, than to have polluted the chaste labours of the Baron Verulam."

In speaking of the Latin translation of the *Essays*² and of the book itself, Tenison wrote:—"The Essays, or Counsels Civil and Moral, though a by-work also, do yet make up a book of greater weight by far than the Apophthegms; and coming home to men's business and bosoms, his lordship entertained the persuasion concerning them, that the Latin volume might last as long as books should last. His lordship wrote them in the English tongue, and enlarged them as occasion served, and at last added to them the 'Colors of Good and Evil', which are likewise found in his book 'De Augmentis'. The Latin translation of them was a work performed by divers hands; by those of Dr. Hacket (late Bishop of Lichfield), Mr. Benjamin Jonson (the learned and judicious poet) and some others whose names I once heard from Dr. Rawley, but I cannot now recall them. To this Latin edition he gave the title of 'Sermones Fideles' after the manner of the Jews, who called the words Adagies or Observations of the Wise, Faithful Sayings; that is, credible propositions worthy of firm assent and ready acceptance."

With reference to *The Wisdom of the Ancients*³ the author of 'Baconiana' remarked: it is "a book in which the sages of former times are rendered more wise than it may be they were by so dextrous an interpreter of their fables."

"The General Acceptance of Bacon's works," wrote Tenison, "has expos'd him to that ill and unjust usage which is common to Eminent Writers. Neither hath the Lord Bacon gone without his share in this Injustice from the Press. He hath been ill dealt with in the Letters printed in the Cabala and Scrinia under his name."

¹Aretino Pietro (1492-1557) patronised by Frances I of France and noted for a disreputable life and for his licentious verses.

²Ten of these were first published in English in a small duodecimo volume in 1597, with the title, "Essays, Religious Meditations, Places of Perswasion and Disswasion—Seene and allowed" and dedicated to his "deare Brother M. Anthony Bacon." The Quarto containing 58 essays appeared in 1625.

³Bacon wrote this little work in 1609 and it was first published in Latin under the title *De Sapientia Veterum Liber*. The first English translation was made by his great admirer, Sir Arthur Georges, or Gorges, in 1619, with a dedication to Princess Elizabeth, wife of the Elector Palatine.

"Rawley had left nothing to a future hand, which he found to be of moment, or communicable to the public, save only some few Latin Works soon after to be published."

"Amongst the papers which Rawley possessed was a letter to the Marquess Fiat, the Embassadour from France, who 'impatient of seeing so Learned a Man, was admitted to his Lordship when he was very ill, and confin'd to his Bed, and who saluted him with this high Compliment. 'Your Lordship hath been to me hitherto like the Angels, of which I have often heard and read but never saw them before.' To which piece of courtship he returned such answer as became a man in those circumstances—'Sir, the charity of others does liken me to an angel, but my own Infirmities tell me I am a Man.'"

In the conclusion of the Preface, Thomas Tenison said: "I think it more desirable to write a mean Preface to a good Book, than be the author of a mean book, though graced with a Preface from some excellent Pen." November 30, 1678.

Next we have "*Lord Bacon's Remains Civil and Moral*". Printed for Richard Chiswell at the Rose and Crown in St. Paul's Churchyard, 1679.

"The Charge by Sir Francis Bacon his Majesty's Attorney General by way of Evidence against Frances Countess of Somerset concerning the poysoning of Sir Thomas Overbury, and the Charge against Robert, Earl of Somerset."

"Letter to King James touching the Chancellor's Place, and another for Relief of his Estate, about a year and a half after Bacon's Retirement, wherein he subscribes himself, 'Your Majesty's poor Ancient Servant and Beadsman, Fr. St. Alb.'"

"Certain Apophthegms of Lord Bacon hitherto unpublished."

"*Ornamenta Rationalia*."

"A collection of Sentences out of the Mimi of Publius, Englished by the Publishers;" and lastly, "A collection of Sentences out of some of the Writings of the Lord Bacon."

The title-page to Part II runs as follows:

"*Baconiana Physiologica* or Certain Remains of Sir Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, and Viscount of St. Albans in arguments appertaining to Natural Philosophy. Printed (as previously)."

"Conditions of Entities". "Inquisitions touching the Compounding of Metals."

"Articles of Questions touching Minerals; written originally in English, by the Lord Bacon, but hitherto not put in that language."

"Dr. Meverill's answers to the Lord Bacon's Questions, concerning the Compounding, Incorporating, or Union of Metals and Minerals."

"The Lord Bacon's Articles of Inquiry concerning Minerals. The second letter of the Cross-Row¹ touching the separations of Metals and Minerals."

¹The Cross-Row was the alphabet, more properly called the Christcross Row: cf. "And from the crossrow plucks the letter G."—Shakespeare.

"Dr. Meverill's Answer touching the separation of Metals and Minerals."

"The 3rd and 4th Letters of the Cross-Row: the 3rd touching Variation of Metals. Dr. Meverill's Answers. The 4th letter of the Cross-Row touching Restitution. Dr. Meverill's Answers."

"The Lord Verulam's Inquisition concerning the Versions, Transmutations, and Multiplications, and Effectives of Bodies, written by him originally in English, but not hitherto put in that language."

"A Speech touching the recovery of Drowned Mineral Works prepared for Parliament by the Viscount of St. Albans, the Lord High Chancellor of England."

"Certain Experiments made by the Lord Bacon about Weight in Air and Water."

"Certain sudden Thoughts of Lord Bacon's set down by him under the Title of Experiments for Profit."

"Certain Experiments about the Commixture of Liquors only, not solids."

"A Catalogue of Bodies Attractive and not Attractive, made by the Lord Bacon together with Experimental Observations about Attraction."

Section III, "*Baconiana Medica*", is comparatively short. "Remains . . . touching Medical matters".

"A Medical Paper of the Lord Bacon to which he gave the Title of Grains of Youth."

"A Catalogue of Astringents, Openers, and Cordials instrumental to Health."

"An Extract by the Lord Bacon for his own use out of the Book of the Prolongation of Life together with some new Advices in order to Health."

Medical Receipts.

The Baconiana Theologica IV: "A Few Remains . . . relating to Divine Matters," "are brief indeed, consisting of:—

"The Lord Bacon's Questions about the Lawfulness of War for the Propagating of Religion."

"Two Prayers. (i) The Student's Prayer.¹

(ii) The Writer's Prayer."²

¹The Supplication is as follows:

"We humbly and earnestly beg that Human things may not prejudice such as are Divine: neither that from the unlocking of the gates of sense, and the kindling of a greater natural light, anything of incredulity or intellectual night may arise in our minds towards Divine Misteries. But rather, that by our mind thoroughly cleansed and purged from fancy and vanities, and yet subject and perfectly given up to the Divine Oracles, there may be given unto Faith the things that are Faith's."

²The concluding invocation runs thus:

"Wherefore if we labour in Thy works with the sweat of our brows, thou wilt make us partakers of thy Vision and Sabbath. We humbly beg that this mind may be steadfastly in us, and that thou, by our hands, and also by the hands of others, on whom thou shalt bestow the same spirit, wilt please to convey a largeness of new alms to thy family of Mankind . . ."

A longer section follows : "*Baconiana Bibliographia*" V, "or Certain Remains of the Lord Bacon Concerning his Writings. To these are added Letters and Discourses by others upon the same argument. In which also are contained some remarks concerning his Life."

"The Lord Chancellor Bacon's Letter to the Queen of Bohemia in Answer to one from her Majesty, and upon sending to her his Book about a War with Spain."¹

"A Letter of Lord Bacon to the University of Cambridge upon his sending to their Public Library his Book of the 'Advancement of Learning'. Also the 'Novum Organum', Ditto, 'To the most Famous College of the holy and undivided Trinity in Cambridge—Health'. In each case, 'in Latin with translation by the Publisher'."

"The Lord Chancellor Bacon's Letter to Dr. Williams² then Lord Bishop of Lincoln concerning his speeches, etc."

"A Letter written in Latin by the Lord Verulam to Father Fulgentio³, the Venetian, concerning his Writings, and now translated into English by the Publisher."

"A Letter of the Lord Bacon's in French, to the Marquess Fiat relating to his Essays." Fiat, Bacon mentioned, "had chus'd his Book of the Advancement of Learning to be translated into French, and sends him a Recompilment of my Essaies Moral and Civil but in such manner enlarged and enriched both in Number and Weight, that it is in effect a new Work."

"A Transcript by the Publisher out of the Lord Bacon's last Will, relating especially to his Writings." Burial in St. Michael's Church, near St. Albans. "I would to have the Charge of my Funeral not to exceed 300*l.* at most."⁴ For my Name and Memory I leave it to foreign nations and to mine own Country-men after some time be passed over." "But towards that durable part of memory, which consisteth in my Writings, I require my Servant Henry Percy, to deliver to my Brother, Constable⁵ all my Manuscript Compositions, and the fragments also of such as are not Finished, to the end that if any of them be fit to be Published, he may accordingly dispose of them."

¹Two tracts, one entitled "Some Considerations touching a War with Spain" and the other, "An Advertisement touching a Holy War" were written by Bacon in retirement for Buckingham, and are supposed to be a kindly acknowledgement for the Duke's officer in relieving him of the final portion of his sentence.

²Bishop Williams: Bacon's successor to the office of Lord Chancellor, was most unfriendly towards him, and strongly disapproved of King James assisting him in his pecuniary difficulties.

³In this letter Bacon sketches out pretty fully the plan of his great undertaking—the "Instauratio"—and expresses his disappointment in that he has given up all hope "of ever seeing the full accomplishment of his philosophic scheme." The whole letter is of the deepest interest.

⁴Bacon's debts at the alleged date of his death, 9th April, 1626, amounted to £20,000.

⁵Sir John Constable was Bacon's brother-in-law. The 1612 edition of the Essays "imprinted at London by John Beale", was dedicated to him. He was one of Bacon's executors, "receiving the valuable legacy of all his books".

And herein I desire him to take the Advice of Mr. Selden,¹ and Mr. Herbert² of the Inner Temple, and to publish or suppress what shall be thought fit. In particular I wish the Elegie which I writ 'in felices Memoriam Elizabethae' may be Published."³

"Letter from University of Oxford upon his sending them his Book 'De Augmentis Scientiarum', in Latin translated by Publisher." Dec. 20, 1623.

"A Letter written by Dr. Roger Maynwaring to Dr. Rawley, concerning the Lord Bacon's Confession of Faith."

"A Letter written by Dr. Rawley to Monsieur Deodate concerning his publishing of the Lord Bacon's Works, in Latin and translated by Publisher." March 9, 1632.

"And Monsieur Aeline Deodate's reply. London, April 4, 1633. in Latin, etc."

"My design of a Translation of the Natural History has not succeeded so happily as I could wish."

"The first Letter of Mr. Isaac Grüter⁴ to Dr. Rawley concerning the MSS of the Lord Bacon, in Latin etc." The Hague, May 29, 1652.

"His (Grüter's) brother had made a latin translation of the Natural History."

"A Second Letter of Grüter to Rawley in Latin etc." Maastricht, March 20, *new style* 1655.

"A Third Letter of Grüter to Rawley in Latin etc." July 1, *new style* 1659.

"A brief Account of the Life and particularly of the Writings of the Lord Bacon written by that Learned Antiquarian, Sir William Dugdale⁵, Norrey King of Arms, in the second Tome of his Book, entitled 'The Baronage of England,' together with divers Insertions by the Publisher."

Finally we reach the section VI.

"Character of the Lord Bacon." 'London' (as before).

¹Dr. John Selden (1584-1654), jurist and scholar. His famous *Table Talk*, published 1689, of which Coleridge remarked: "there is more weighty bullion sense in this book than I can find in the same number of pages of any uninspired writer" is largely a collection of the sayings of Bacon. It is most likely that Selden and Thomas Hobbes assisted him in making some of his translations, especially those of the *Essays* and *Henry the Seventh*.

²Dr. George Herbert (1593-1633) the poet, seems to have been the confidant for whom Bacon had the greatest regard and affection, and was no doubt one of those "good pens that do not forsake me." Bacon dedicated his "Psalms into Verse" to Herbert (published, 1624).

³Written in 1608 this little work was not published until 1651 in a small duodecimo volume along with two other tracts. It afterwards found a place in Rawley's *Opuscula Varia Posthuma* (1658). It is a dissertation on the virtues of the Queen and the troubles and factions she experienced and overcame.

⁴Grüter published at Amsterdam in 1653 a small duodecimo volume, under the title *Francisci Baconi de Verulamio Scripta in Naturala et Universali Philosophia*, in Latin.

⁵Sir William Dugdale (1605-1686), herald and antiquarian. His 'Baronage' appeared in 1675-6.

"A Character of the Lord Bacon, Given by Dr. Peter Heylin¹ in his 'Life of Archbishop Laud. Anno 1620'."

"The Lord Chancellor Bacon, was a man of the most strong Brain, and a chymical Head; designing his endeavours to the perfecting of the Works of Nature; or rather improving Nature to the best Advantages of Life, and the common benefit of mankind. Pity it was, he was not entertained with some liberal salary, abstracted from all affairs both of Court and Judicature, and furnished with sufficiency both of Means and Helps for the going on of his Design. Which had it been, he might have given us such a body of Natural Philosophy, and made it so subservient to the public good, that neither Aristotle, nor Theophrastus amongst the ancients; nor Paracelsus, or the rest of our latter Chymists, would have been considerable."

"A Character of the Lord Bacon given by Dr. Sprat² in his History of the Royal Society."

Referring here to the "New Philosophers, who have disagreed from the Ancients," the biographer proceeds: "I shall only mention one Great Man who had the true Imagination of the whole extent of this Enterprize, as it is now set on foot; and that is, the Lord Bacon. In whose Books there are everywhere scattered the best arguments that can be produced for the defence of Experimental Philosophy; and the best directions that are needful to promote it . . . Who have always lived in the crowd, and borne the greatest burden of Civil Business; should yet find leisure enough for those retired Studies, and to excel all those men who separate themselves for this very purpose. He was a man of strong, clear and powerful Imaginations. His Genius was searching, and inimitable. And of this I need give no other proof than his Style itself; which as, for the most part it describes men's minds, as well as pictures do their bodies; So it did His, above all men living. The Course of it was vigorous and majestic: The Wit bold and familiar. The Comparisons fetched out of the way, and yet the most easie: In all expressing a Soul equally skilled in Men and Nature . . ."

¹Peter Heylin (1600-1662), ecclesiastical writer, and a supporter of Charles I. Deprived of his preferments under the Commonwealth, he was made sub-Dean of Westminster at the Restoration. His 'Life of Laud' (*Cyprianus Anglicanus*) was published in 1668.

²Thomas Sprat (1635-1713), divine and poet. A mathematician, he was one of the first members of the Royal Society, of which he was the historian. He also wrote a Life of his friend Cowley, and died Bishop of Rochester.

BACON'S DEATH IN 1626

by R. L. EAGLE

PUZZLED by the scarcity of contemporary allusion to Bacon's death at Arundel House, Highgate (the London home of Thomas Howard, Earl Marshal) on 9th April 1626, Mrs. Pott wrote an article in *BACONIANA*, in 1904, to suggest that Bacon arranged for a false report to be made of his death, and that he then left for the Continent. She was answered most efficiently by Mr. G. C. Bompas, but the theory was revived nine years later, since when other Baconians have re-hashed the theme with elaborate and, I consider, fanciful additions and variations. It is entirely made up of speculation devoid of anything which could pass for evidence.

One of the points overlooked is that Bacon had been for five years in an eclipse. He was an obscure, lonely and forsaken man. Nearly all his friends had deserted fallen greatness as there was nothing further to be gained from this generous but bankrupt man. Bacon had no desire for an ostentatious funeral. In his will, dated 19th December 1625, he expressed a desire to be buried in the little church of St. Michael at Gorhambury "for there was my mother buried, and it is the parish church of my mansion house of Gorhambury, and it is the only Christian Church within the walls of Old Verulam." An "Inquisition" on the estate and his assets and liabilities was held on 7th July, 1626, but the "Inquisition" which remains at the Record Office was held at Chipping Barnet on 15th October 1634, when the executors were at last in a position to make a statement of his affairs.

His widow, Alice, Viscountess St. Alban, married Sir John Underhill with indecent haste after enduring only eleven days of widowhood. She was then thirty-four years of age. Following almost continuous litigation from 1626 until 1632, she and Underhill consented to vacate Gorhambury at Michaelmas 1632, and the mansion was purchased by Bacon's former secretary, Sir Thomas Meautys. Have those disciples of Mrs. Pott's curious theory considered the position of Bacon's widow and Sir John Underhill? Do they know that the punishment for bigamy in those days was *death*? Surely we are not going to be asked to believe that Alice and Underhill did not know whether her husband was alive or dead! There is a limit to credulity, at least with some of us. Are they not also aware that nobody was allowed to leave the country without a passport, and that anybody found attempting to do so would be severely punished? Penalties for offences against the laws were terribly severe. Even if Bacon had taken the risk and succeeded in getting to the Continent, he would have had to possess a permit to enter and reside abroad. It will be seen, therefore, that the idea of Bacon's getting abroad and living to a ripe

old age is preposterous. At the age of sixty-six he had already far exceeded the average span of life in those days, and he had always been of a delicate constitution. The fact that he reached that age is quite surprising.

It is unreasonable to build up any suspicion because of the fewness of direct references to Bacon's death and burial. We have no records of the deaths and funerals of many famous men of the period who died at the height of their renown and power. Why, then, should we expect an exception to be made in the case of a man deserted by his wife, childless, poor and almost friendless?

The first mention of Bacon's death is found in a letter dated 10th April, 1626, from Sir Benjamin Rudyard, at Whitehall, to Sir Francis Nethersole, in which, after giving some news, he adds: "Lord St. Albans is dead, and so is Sir Thomas Compton." The reference can be found in *State Papers Domestic*, Charles I. In the postscript of a letter from Meautys to his cousin, Lady Jane Cornwallis in Suffolk, sent in April 1626, he writes "Your brother went to the Low Countries yesterday in hope to return some six weeks hence. His lady remains with my Lady Sussex. The Lo. St. Albans is dead and buried."

In the Tobie Matthew collection is the letter written by Bacon during his fatal illness:

"My very good Lord,

I was likely to have had the fortune of Caius Plinius the Elder, who lost his life by trying an experiment about the burning of the mountain Vesuvius. For I was also desirous to try an experiment or two touching the conservation and induration of bodies. As for the experiment itself, it succeeded excellently well; but in the journey I was taken with such a fit of casting as I knew not whether it were the stone or some surfeit, or cold, or indeed a touch of all three. But, when I came to your Lordship's house I was not able to go back, and therefore was forced to take up my lodging here, where your housekeeper is very careful and diligent about me; which I assure myself your Lordship will not only pardon towards him, but think the better of him for it. For indeed your Lordship's house was happy to me; and I kiss your noble hands for the welcome which I am sure you give me to it. . . I know now how unfit it is for me to write to your Lordship with any other hand than mine own; but, in truth, my fingers are so disjoined with this fit of sickness that I cannot steadily hold a pen."¹

Arundel and his wife were confined to their country house at Horseley, Sussex, having incurred the displeasure of Charles I over the marriage of their son to Elizabeth, daughter of Esme Stuart, for whom the King had arranged another match.

In the last winter of his life he wrote to Buckingham from Gorchamby:

"here I live upon the sword-point of a sharp air, endangered if I go abroad, dulled if I stay within, solitary and comfortless without company; banished from all opportunities to treat with any to do myself good, and to help out my wrecks; and that which is one of my greatest griefs, my wife, that hath been no partaker of my offending, must be a partaker of this misery of my restraint."

¹"Collection of Letters made by Sir Tobie Matthew, Knight" (1660).

That is the letter of a very sick man who must have realized, when he made his will, that his days were numbered.

Among the State Papers in 1626 we find:

"Minutes of application for an order for £1000 borrowed by the late Viscount St. Alban from Sir John Wolstenholme in 1616, to be repaid out of the annuity granted to the said Viscount out of the Alienation Office."

The chief authority for the date and place of Bacon's death has always been Dr. William Rawley's life of him. All the writers of the *Mans Verulamiani* had been informed of Bacon's death in 1626. Were they the victims of a lie?

Letters of administration were granted on 18th July 1627 to two of Bacon's creditors—Sir Robert Rich and Thomas Meautys.

That Bacon was buried, in accordance with his own wish, in St. Michael's Church is well attested by the desecration of his skull by Dr. King of St. Albans, when the remains were exposed at the funeral of Sir Thomas Meautys. The incident is recorded in *The History of King Charles* by H. L. Esquire, 1656, and also in Fuller's *Worthies*, 1662. The occurrence is well authenticated, and provides sufficient proof that Bacon was buried in St. Michael's Church, and that Sir Thomas Meautys lies in an adjoining grave. Presumably Dr. King was the physician who had attended Meautys who died in 1649. Dr. King was one of the Governors of St. Albans School, and he was also a Justice of the Peace.

As anything recorded about Bacon and his friends and relations is, or should be, of interest to Baconians, it may not be out of place to quote the "Inquisition Post Mortem" (Chancery Series II, Vol. 515, No. 75) preserved at the Record Office:

"Inquisition indented, taken at Chipping Barnet in Co. Hertford, 15 October, 10 Charles (1634) before Richard Luckin, Esq., Escheator of the King, by virtue of a writ of mandamus, after the death of Francis Lord Bacon, late Viscount St. Alban, deceased, by the oath of Roger Marshe gent., and other jurors, who say that Francis Viscount St. Alban, long before his death, was seized in his demesne as of fee of and in the manors of Gorhambury, Westwicke and Braye with their appurtenances, and of and in 12 messuages, 3 mills, 6 dovecotes, 12 gardens, 1200 acres of land, 100 acres of meadow, 500 acres of pasture, 400 acres of wood, and the view of frank-pledge, with appurtenances in the parishes of St. Michael, St. Stephen, St. Peter, St. Alban, and in Redburne and Hersteed in Co. Hertford, and of and in the advowsons of the Vicarage of the Churches of St. Michael and Redburne aforesaid. And that Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Alban, so thereof being seized by his indenture tri-party bearing date 9th May, 6 James (1608) between the said Viscount St. Alban and Alice his wife by name of Francis Bacon of Gray's Inn, Co. Middlesex, Knight, Solicitor-General of the King, and Lady Alice Bacon, his wife on the one part, and Thomas Underwood and John Younge of Gray's Inn, gent., Ralph Youarte, Christopher Travene, gent., of the second part, and Michael Hyper, Knight, Martin Barneham, Knight, Richard Godfrey, of Chancery Lane, Esq., and William Gerrard, of Gray's Inn, Esq., of

the third part, levied in consideration of the marriage then lately solemnized between the Viscount St. Alban and Alice his wife, also for the love and affection which the Viscount then enjoyed towards Alice, and to the intent that all the manors and premises should be well and sufficiently assured by jointure to Alice for her life, he has assured the manors and premises to Ralph Youarte and Christopher Travenne their heirs and assigns, to the use of Alice during her life for her jointure, and after her death, to the use of Francis Viscount St. Alban, by the name of Sir Francis Bacon, and the heirs of his body begotten upon the body of Alice, and for default of such tail issuing, to the use of William Cooke, of London, Knight, John Constable of Gray's Inn, Knight, Thomas Crewe of Gray's Inn, Esq., Thomas Hetley of Gray's Inn, Esq., and Roger Fenton, Bachelor of Theology, and their heirs and assigns for ever, as in the said Indenture a fine and recovery, more fully appears.

And the jurors say that Francis, being seized as aforesaid of and in the manors and premises at Gorhambury, 9 APRIL DIED, of such his estate so seized without heirs of his body lawfully begotten, and that Thomas Bacon, Esq., is and at the time of the death of Francis was kinsman and next heir of the same Francis, and was aged at the time of the death of Francis, 26 years and more, and that Alice Viscountess St. Alban is still alive.

And the jurors say that the manors of Gorhambury, Westwicke and Bray, and all other premises in Herts are held, and at the time of the death of Francis were held of King Charles in Chief by Knight's service, and are worth by the year in all issues beyond reprises, £25.

And the jurors say that from the death of Francis unto the taking of this Inquisition, Alice Viscountess St. Alban and John Underhill, Knight, in the right of the Viscountess, occupied the premises and received the issues and profits.

And Francis had no other manors or premises at the time of his death."

We might certainly think that after all this litigation which had taken place at intervals from 1626 until 1632, and after the legal transfer of the lands and "the issues and profits" from them (wrongfully appropriated by Alice and Underhill at the expense of Bacon's creditors) Meautys would have felt secure in possession, but it was not so. The spectre of Thomas Bacon was not far away. True, the said Thomas had on 18th June 1630 solemnly renounced his ridiculous claim in favour of the Trustees. Counsel had pronounced against him. His renunciation had been found sufficient, and had been registered by the Court of Chancery, and recorded in its decree. But for all that, the King, on 10th November 1634, gave him Livery and the third part of the Manors, and on 1 December 1635 bade the Escheator of Herts give him possession thereof, as we know from the Deeds at Gorhambury. Who was this Thomas Bacon of Hessett, aged twenty-six in 1626, whose "Pettigree" was unfortunately omitted from the Decree? There were Bacon families at Hessett continuously, or at intervals, from as early as 1286, when Robert Bacon held a messuage and lands there. This Thomas was son of Edmund Bacon of Burton Latimer, Northants. Clearly the real next-of-kin of Francis Bacon was Sir

Edmund Bacon, son of Sir Nicholas (his half-brother) and known to all men as at that time Premier Baronet.

It is apparent from the facts I have quoted that there was no doubt, nor mystery, about Bacon's death in 1626. There would have been the necessary legal proof before the King's "Escheator" and the Court of Chancery—not to mention the jurors, and the tenants of the Gorhambury estates who would have been aware of their landlord's death and burial to pay their rents to Alice and Underhill. There is ample legal and other confirmation of Bacon's death which, in view of his infirmity during the winter of 1625/6, was not unexpected. In BACONIANA (December 1954) Count L. de Randwyck makes the entirely unjustified statement that "it can now be accepted that Francis Bacon died at Stuttgart, December 18th 1647." He is at liberty to accept anything he pleases, but he has no right to consider a general acceptance in the face of all logic and evidence. Whoever died at Stuttgart in 1647, it was not Bacon at the age of eighty-seven!

EDITOR'S NOTE.—For the opposite viewpoint *vide* Correspondence, and in particular Dr. Gerstenberg's letter.

"TOWARDS A MORE CORRECT BIOGRAPHY OF FRANCIS BACON"

(Extracts from an Essay by the late Parker Woodward)

II

"Emblems"

JAN DOUSA, a distinguished politician and poet in the Low Countries, visited England in 1584, and again upon special embassy to the Queen in 1585, when he must have made the acquaintance of Francis Bacon, the Queen's special counsellor. At that time it was desired to print in English an emblem book, with verses similar to the many illustrated emblem books published in Holland, Germany, France, Italy, and Spain. Nothing had been done in this direction in England since the *Shepheards Kalender*, and the reason is not far to seek. To produce an illustrated work in England was a complicated business, because the engraved blocks were mostly the property of Continental printers, of whom the brothers Plantin, of Leyden, were probably the head. Hence the opportunities offered by Jan Dousa's visit.

The Earl of Leicester was then busy with the preparation of an expedition to leave Yarmouth and the other Eastern ports, to go to the help of the Low Countries. We are not told whether Francis visited Yarmouth in the course of this, although it is quite possible. Certainly Jan Dousa would arrive and depart from that part of the coast.

Now a certain Geffery Whitney had been a clerk in the office of the High Steward of Great Yarmouth who was at that time the Earl of Leicester. Serjeant Flowerdew was then Under-Steward and when Flowerdew became a Judge, Whitney was left in charge. The Corporation (with whom rested the appointment of a deputy) would not accept the Earl's suggestion of Whitney in place of Flowerdew, but selected another person. After some difficulty, the Corporation paid Whitney £45 compensation for loss of office. So Whitney was out of a situation, but with some claim upon the Earl to do something to help him.

To assume that "Geffrey" (so he spelt his signature) thereupon became the author of brilliant verses and devoted his £45 capital to the production of an expensive book and drew twenty-four new emblems for it would be rash. It is more probable that Whitney's employment was handed over by the Earl to Francis Bacon, who arranged for him to take his manuscript to Leyden and return with the proofs from time to time; and that any work of overseeing the publication as it passed through Plantin's press was performed by friend Jan Dousa, to whose *Odae Britannicae*, 1586, Francis as "Whitney" seems to have contributed verses.

A Choice of Emblems must have occupied Francis a considerable extent of time in 1585, though it did not obtain publication until

May 1586; it shows the Fra Rosicrosse sigils. Moreover, the internal evidence that Francis was the true author is considerable. This year Sir Philip Sidney died of his wounds received at the battle of Zutphen.

Treatise of Melancholy

This treatise may have occupied Francis a good deal of time in 1586. It was ascribed to the authorship of Timothe Bright, a man formerly in Walsingham's service, and is claimed by Francis in the bilateral cipher story as having been written by him in the name of Bright. Bright, who commenced as apothecary to Sir Francis Walsingham in Paris, seems also to have assisted Francis over a book of shorthand called *Characterie* and one or two other publications. In June 1592, he was preferred to the Rectory of Methley in Yorkshire, in the gift of the Queen.

He died in 1615; and when the real author revised and extended the *Treatise of Melancholy* in 1621, it re-appeared under the title of *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, with the name of his assistant Robert Burton, associated (by Epilogue) as "author". It would probably have appeared as by Democritus Junior had it not been for the trouble Francis was in at that date.

Discourse of English Poesie

The time was approaching in 1586 for the publication of the long-delayed *Faerie Queene*, and as in the Harvey-Immerito Letters of 1580 it was stated that Immerito had written parts of the *Faerie Queene* and that Immerito was "Edmundus", it became necessary to prepare the reading public for the entrance upon the English literary stage of the title-page poet "Edmund Spenser", although that inconvenient person had settled in Ireland instead of returning in a few years' time. Still, if Francis was to produce the poem at all, he had no alternative but to use Edmund Spenser's name.

Fortunately there was a tutor in the Gray family, a member of which family was custodian of the old Saxon palace of Havering-atte-Bower in Essex overlooking the Thames. This palace the Queen often visited and there occasionally held her Court. The name of the tutor was William Webbe, and it may be that he sometimes did copying for Francis.

In Webbe's name Francis inspired a survey or *Discourse of English Poesie* with special reference to the *Shepheards Kalender*, the author of which he insinuated to have been "Edmund Spenser". He also inserted certain vague disclaimers, as follows:

"Whether the author was Master Sp or what scholler in Pembroke Hall soever, because himself and his freendes, for what respect I know not, would not reveale it."

"If his other workes were common abroade which are, as I thinke, in ye charge custodie of certain his friends, we should have of our own poets whom we might match in all respects with the best."

To write in this vein was not difficult for Francis since he was never wanting in confidence of his own exceptional pre-eminence as a poet,

and as he had on the stocks a more elaborate study of poetry in the *Arte of English Poesie* which he did not print until 1589.

Gray's Inn 1586/7

On 10th February, Francis was moved to the Reader's Table by a special order which safeguarded the rights of the other Barristers or Ancients who had priority over him with regard to pensions and other privileges. While it was more in accordance with his sense of dignity that he should sit at the top table, he would naturally desire to remain upon good terms with the members of his Inn, and therefore be careful not to involve them in material loss.

"Robert the Parson" (as Greene was called by his fellow men-players of the Earl of Leicester's company), having returned from performing plays at various Courts in Europe, was again available as a vizard. It thus became possible to print an interesting tale in the name of Greene, entitled *Penelope's Web*, dedicated to the Countess of Warwick and her sister the Countess of Cumberland, who were both daughters of Francis second Earl of Bedford. In the name of Greene there was also published a combination of story and essay, entitled *Euphues censure to Philautus*, dedicated to Robert, Earl of Essex.

The Euphues-Philautus controversy seems to have been carried on for the amusement of private Court circles, and did not die down finally until 1592. Gabriel Harvey called "Greene" the "Ape of Euphues".

Apparently Francis was also busy this year with plays, both for boy and for men players. He was a member of the Queen's sixth Parliament, and of course the great trouble of the year was the trial and execution of Mary Queen of Scots, about which a good deal has been extracted from the biliteral and word ciphers.

"The Misfortunes of Arthur" 1587/8

"Dramatic poetry which has the theatre for its world would be of excellent use if well directed."

Bacon's *De Augmentis*, 1623

Precisely what play was performed for Court entertainment in this year cannot be fixed. But a well written play for the benefit of the barristers of Gray's Inn and their friends was acted at Gray's Inn on 28th February, 1587/8. That it was written by Francis, whose name was definitely connected with the production, goes without saying. The internal evidence of his authorship is very strong.

With the assistance of Timothe Bright he evolved the system of shorthand which, when printed on 250 pages of vellum, he called *Characterie*. It is evident that he was much in need of means whereby his dictation could be taken down more rapidly than in longhand. For his shorthand system he seems to have obtained letters patent to Bright and his assigns for fifteen years "to sell all such books as he theretofore had or thereafter should make, devise, compile, translate or abridge to the furtherance of good knowledge and learning."

This privilege was made use of in the following year in publishing an abridgment of Fox's *Book of Martyrs*, a work much in demand at that time but only available from certain booksellers in a costly folio edition. Owing to Bright's dismissal from an appointment at St. Bartholomew's Hospital in 1591 for neglect of duty (and to his subsequent preference by the Queen to a rectory in Yorkshire!) and possibly because Francis had come to terms with the booksellers, the letters patent scheme was not pursued.

Tales in "Greene's" name—*Pandosto or the Triumph of Time*, *Perimedes the Blacksmith* and *Alcida, or Greene's Metamorphosis*—were printed about this year but troubles over the Spanish Armada, and the preparations to defeat a landing, must have put an end for the time being to further publishing by Francis. Then came the death of his patron, the Earl of Leicester, on 4th September. In November, Francis was elected M.P. for the important constituency of Liverpool.

"The Art of English Poesie" 1588/9

This was a busy year for Francis. The important work on the art of poetry, which appears to have been undertaken by command of the Queen, and to which she contributed verses, was now published anonymously, but with private markings indicating that it had been written by Francis. Since it was dedicated to Lord Burleigh and had been begun as early as 1585, one may suppose that the cost of it was borne out of the privy purse. It shows that the author was expert in most forms of verse, and master of all the technicalities of poetry.

Other works in the name of Greene, some of them probably held over from the previous year, comprised *Ciceronis Amor*, *Menaphon* and *The Spanish Masquerado*. A new assistant, Nashe, then aged twenty-one now appeared as the author of a preface to *Menaphon*, and also of a dissertation entitled *The Anatomy of Absurditie*. A narrative poem called *Glaucus and Scilla* was title-paged to Lodge, but so like is it in style and quality to *Venus and Adonis* (printed in 1593 in the name of Shakespeare) that critics, in rejecting the obvious possibility that the same author wrote both have come to the extraordinary conclusion that the author of the latter poem learnt how to write it by a diligent study of the former!

Some years later in 1603, Francis mentioned in a letter to the Earl of Northumberland that he had prepared the draft of a proclamation to be used by King James before his entrance into London "it being a thing familiar in my Mistress's time to have my pen used in public writings of satisfaction". So that, quite apart from the cipher claims, it may reasonably be supposed that the "*Farewell*" poem written to commemorate the English expedition to the coast of the Spanish peninsula, and *An Eclogue Gratulatorie* (to welcome Robert Earl of Essex on his return), were inspired by him, though title-paged to "Peck". With the "*Farewell*"—which was only a few verses—was bound a short poem called "*A Tale of Troy*".

After so much "duty" work for the Queen, Francis tried once

more to obtain some good salaried appointment. He addressed a petition to the Queen in the pen-name under which he had written several comedies for performance by the Chapel children—viz. "John Lyly". In this he pointed out how for ten years he had devoted much time to the Revels with a hopeful expectation of the office of Master (then and until 1610 held by Tylney). He considered he was "wasting time, wittes, and hopes" writing plays at the Court, and thought he had been playing the fool too long. No mere subject could have written such a petition. Had a real John Lyly written it he would have been in grave danger, and Lord Burleigh would not have troubled to preserve the letter among his papers. The Queen must have been in some difficulty. Francis certainly deserved something, but money was always scarce with her. In the end she gave him the reversion to the Clerkship to the Star Chamber, which office was valued at £1,600 per annum, and even that gift was due to Burleigh's strenuous pressure. However it was something he could turn into money if he could find a purchaser sanguine enough to speculate upon the expectation of life of Mr. Mills, who then held the office. In one of his later letters, Francis compared it with a neighbour's land "which might mend his prospect, but did not fill his barn."

Towards the close of this year or the beginning of the next, a sharp pamphleteering attack was commenced against the clergy of the Established Church, of which his friend Whitgift, as Archbishop of Canterbury, was the head. It was known as the Martin-Marprelate controversy. It was most probably Francis Bacon who came to the aid of the Archbishop, and may have inspired pamphlets that ridiculed the Martinists. His pamphlets were severally entitled *A Counter-cuffe of Pasquill of England*, *Retourne of Pasquill* and *Pappe with an Hatchet*, all anonymous.

(to be continued)

BOOK REVIEW

The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History by W. W. GREG. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955, 500 pp.

The book is written well within the orthodox pale, the author, now in his 81st year, being case-hardened in his orthodoxy. He makes "no pretence to originality. All I have tried to do is to set out the evidence and summarize on each point under discussion the view now generally held by scholars, or, if there is no commonly accepted opinion . . . the views with which I personally agree." He gives not the slightest consideration to the Baconian evidence that has amassed during the past hundred years, and he ignores such vital evidence as the Northumberland Manuscript and the reference to *Richard II* in Francis Bacon's *Apophthegms* and in his *Apologia* concerning Essex. Bacon is mentioned but once, merely as author of the *Essays*; and the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy never. It is significant that he never refers to the events in the life of the supposed author of Stratford-on-Avon, or seeks to relate his arguments thereto. With these limitations, and the complete absence of any reference to the original manuscripts of the Folio or any of the Plays, and the correspondence connected therewith, it is not clear what "original" matter of value our author *could* have offered.

Heminge and Condell, whose names appear in the Folio as signatures to the Dedication and the address "To the Great Variety of Readers," are said by our author to have made themselves responsible for producing the Folio, no one being able to speak with greater authority. Yet, twelve years later, the Barbage brothers, in addressing the same Earl of Pembroke to whom the Folio had been dedicated can describe Heminge and Condell as being no more than "dearving men" and "men players". However, our author, having pre-determined that these two men players were, indeed, the "editors" of the Folio writes:

"The modern critic and the modern editor have therefore a problem of their own: to ascertain the way in which the first editors set about their task, and to detect, if possible, in each individual instance the source of the text they chose and the nature of the authority that lay behind it. It is no use pretending that this is easy or that certainty is always, if ever, possible."

He then proceeds to consider the position as regards each Play, emphasizing the differences of opinion of the critics, and this forms the major portion of the book. As can be imagined, both his opinion and that of the critics is based largely on conjecture, as is common to all orthodox criticism on "Shakespeare". In one instance, where critic B "refuses to surrender" to critic A, the author writes—

"And so the dispute continues without any certain conclusion in sight . . . It is to be hoped that before long some competent investigator with no preconceived ideas may be found to undertake the rather arduous task."

Such is the orthodox position, after three hundred years, during which the critics, whose name is Legion, have again and again scoured every inch of the field! If our author would have an impartial investigation of a matter about which orthodoxy itself cannot agree, then, obviously, he must break new ground and venture beyond the pale.

T. WRIGHT

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *BACONIANA*

Dear Sir,

In *BACONIANA*, No. 151, "Trophonius" objects to Mr. Edward D. Johnson's statement: "On the 22nd January 1560 Francis Bacon was born at Wolsey's new palace, Whitehall, London."

It is of course true that Dr. Rawley, first and last chaplain to Bacon, begins his short life of the great Chancellor with the words:

"Francis Bacon, was born in *York House, or York Place*, in the Strand, on the two and twentieth day of January in the year of our Lord 1560."

It is also held by some that Bacon was the natural son of a secret marriage between Queen Elizabeth and the Earl of Leicester, and that this passage in Rawley's *Life of Bacon* is intentionally ambiguous and points to his really having been born at Whitehall, which in the time of Cardinal Wolsey, was called York Place (see *Henry VIII*, Act iv, sc. 1). Whether or not this old name remained in vernacular use for a while after the Cardinal's fall, the fact that Rawley draws attention to it seems to invite inquiry. Incidentally the words "in York House, or York Place" appear in italics.

However the need for any such deliberate equivocation has disappeared in the Latin version of 1658. There the passage in question runs:

"Franciscus Baconus, Seculi & gentis suae decus, ornator et ornamentum literarum, natus est in Palatio Eboracensi, infra plateam dictam le Strand, juxta Londinum, 22 Januarij, Anno Salutis Humanae MDLX."

This also is the typographical form of the passage in the genuine "First Folio" of Bacon (overlooked by Spedding) which appeared in Frankfort-o-Main (Germany) in 1665.

Every Latin-English Dictionary will inform us that "palatium" in its original form, refers to the residence of Romulus, the first Roman King, on the Mons Palatinus, and that "palatium" in its early use, always means "a dwelling of a prince". On the other hand Roderick Eagle's valuable statement in *BACONIANA* No. 149 has to be taken into account, i.e. "that in Elizabethan times, all the great mansions along the riverside were called 'Place' rather than 'House'."

May I also draw attention to two further remarkable features in this first folio edition of Bacon's *Opera Omnia* of 1665?

- (1) The last paragraph of its "Vita" contains extensive differences to that of earlier editions.
- (2) It exhibits striking pictorial parallels to the Shakespeare First Folio of 1623. One may be seen by comparing "page 3" of both works, the other consists in the pictorial representation of Jupiter mounted upon an eagle, which is repeated eight times in the "Frankfort Folio", and to which I cannot find a parallel in literature save in "Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*, Act v, sc. 4. where in a stage direction "Jupiter descends in Thunder and Lightning sitting upon an eagle. He throws a thunderbolt".

(See frontispiece)

Yours truly,

JOACHIM GERSTERNBERG, Ph D.

To the Editor of *BACONIANA*

Dear Sir,

I too, was much astonished by Count de Radwyck's statement (in *BACONIANA*, No. 150) that "Francis Bacon died at Stuttgart, December 18th, 1647", and like Mr. Howard Bridgewater, I am most anxious to learn whether this statement can be supported by fact, possibly in connection with the Rosicrucians, who had one of their main centres in this very part of Germany.

If supported, this statement would throw an interesting light upon the possible friendship between Bacon and John Valentin Andreas, who was one of the leading Rosicrucians and probably the real author of the three great manifestoes

The name of Andreas appears together with the name of Bacon in a marginal note of Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (p. 37 on my 8th Edition 1676) opposite to a passage which runs thus:

"Utopian parity is a kind of government to be wished for, rather than effected 'Repub. Christianopolitans', Campanella's 'City of the Sun', and that 'New Atlantis' witty fictions but meer Chimeras a.s.o."

Andreas, during the period in question, lived in Stuttgart and partly in Bebenhausen, a small village with an old romantic Abbey and Castle very near to the old German University of Tübingen. Andreas had studied in Tübingen, which is not far from Stuttgart. If the statement should prove correct, the very rich libraries both of Bebenhausen and Tübingen should be examined for possible marginal notes by the hand of Bacon.

W. F. C. Wigston has left us his very fine work about *Bacon, Shakespeare and the Rosicrucians* (1891). Wigston, however, partly scoffed at Thomas de Quincey's *Rosicrucians and Freemasons*, and de Quincey, again, scoffed at the German Professor J. G. Buhle (*Rosenkreuzer und Freimaurer*, Göttingen, 1804) who seems to have been the first to deal with the problem scientifically. Wigston as well as de Quincey ignore the fact that it was old Professor Buhle who, as early as in 1804, brought the name of Bacon into connection with the Rosicrucians for the first time. And Bacon's name is not even mentioned either in A. E. Waite's otherwise brilliant book *The Real history of the Rosicrucians* (1887), which has been rightly appreciated by Mrs. Pott in her own admirable book *Francis Bacon and his Secret Society*.

There are very strong reasons to support the belief that Francis Bacon did not die on Easter Sunday 1626, but lived on at least until about 1640. In this connection, may I draw attention to two very curious pages at the very end of the *Advancement of Learning* 1640, "interpreted" by Gilbert Wats, also mentioned by Count de Randwyck in his letter? I wonder whether these two pages have been noticed before? They are both written in Latin. One is supposed to be written by the "Typographer to the Reader" and runs thus:

"Since the one or the other page has been left free—much to the damage of the bookseller—we have decided to fill the space and to add a letter which the most notable author has sent and has secured with his own hand to his College (italics are mine). It is our concern to let live these transitory lines, but it is your concern, my reader, that they might work. It is a short page but a substantial one. And it is well worth to preserve even the remains of great men. Farewell!"

Now the opposite page is the letter of the author to Trinity College, Cambridge. It reads (in the translation of Archbishop Tenison in his *Baconiana* of 1679 on p. 193 and reprinted by Spedding in *Letters and Life*, Vol. VII, p. 439):

"All things and all the growths thereof are due to their beginnings. And therefore seeing that I drew my beginning of knowledge from your fountains, I have thought it right to return to you the increase of the same, hoping likewise that these things of mine will spring up the more happily among you, as being in their native soil. Wherefore I exhort you likewise, while duly retaining the modesty of your minds and your reverence for the ancients, not to be wanting on your part also to the advancement of the sciences, but next after the sacred volumes of the word of God and the Scriptures, to study earnestly and before all other books (which ought to be counted only as commentaries upon it) that great volume of the works of God and his Creatures. Farewell!"

Spedding is apparently not aware that all the three letters he reprints, one after the other (one addressed to the University of Oxford, the second to the University of Cambridge and the third, quoted above to Trinity College of Cambridge) have been published altogether in this edition of the *Advancement* of 1640. For he remarks, summarily: "The letters accompanying the copies of the work presented to the Universities and to Trinity College are not dated, but belong no doubt to this time" (i.e. 1623, the year of the Latin version of the *Advancement*, i.e. *De Augmentis*).

In this I believe he was wrong. Although at least to a Baconian, it is significant that the phrase "to study that great volume of the works of God and his

Creatures" (as Bacon puts it here in his *Advancement*) matches the phrase "to see how God in all his creatures works" of "Shakespeare's" *Henry VI* (2), the express statement of "Typographus" is of greater significance.

This statement, in the well known manner of Baconian mockery, indicates that the "most noble author" has "sent and secured this letter by his own hand" and reveals that Bacon was alive when the edition of 1640 was published.

Yours truly,

JOACHIM GERSTENBERG, Ph.D.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

BACON AS METHUSALAH!

In the *19th Century and After* (April 1914), is an article called "A French Ambassador's Impressions of England in the year 1666," by J. J. Jusserand wherein is mentioned:

"The ambassador Count Cominges, it may be recalled, had been asked by his king to give him an account of English men of letters. His answer had been of a less ample character than Lord Morley's famous Series, and had consisted in the mere enumeration of the four names of Morus, Buchanan Bacon, and 'a man called Miltonius who has rendered himself more infamous by his noxious writings than the very tormentors and assassins of their king'."

Of Shakespeare Cominges had never heard.

While writing to you the above-mentioned, I should like to answer in BACONIANA Mr. Howard Bridgewater's letter (BACONIANA, No. 151).

My "fantastic" statement is still unanswered, but it has never been contradicted. Therefore I was, in my opinion, justified to conclude in that sense. Mr. Bridgewater's letter did not astonish me. I expected such a letter; however not with a question, but with arguments to convince me of Dr. Speckman's error.

To make criticism possible I forwarded photocopies of his booklet to three libraries in England, as mentioned in BACONIANA, No. 150. May I hope that Dr. Speckman's booklet *Francis Bacon und sein Tod in Stuttgart in 1647*, will be criticised now and in that answer the real name will be given to the hypothetical Paulus Jenischious, born in Antwerp on June 17th, 1588?

Yours truly,

VAN RANDWYCK
(Connt)

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

Mr. Alan Smith in his letter in the current issue of BACONIANA asks—in short—how I became a believer in Mrs. Gallup. Incidentally, one can read his thought as he sits down to write his delightfully couched sentences.

No, Mr. Smith, it is not quite "total ignorance" to even "implicit conviction." In my letter I really wanted to know if the work of Mrs. Gallup had been checked and found correct to the satisfaction of the "Society"—instead of one or two small attempts by individual members who never seemed to complete the full work.

My reason for stating I believed in Mrs. Gallup was that some years ago the late Mr. Henry Seymour, who was one of the best cipherists in the country and helped considerably during the 1914 war in that capacity, convinced me without doubt of the sincerity and truth of Mrs. Gallup.

Mr. Seymour worked out the cipher in *Henry VII* 1622 edition, and it took him a year. There are 75,000 odd italic letters, 400 wrong fount letters, and they come to the exact number that Mrs. Gallup de-ciphered. The only information Mr. Seymour had from Mrs. Gallup at the time was which edition of *Henry VII* she used, as there were five known different editions of this book, all bearing the date 1622.

Mrs. Gallup was blind at the time (1922) and could not have helped even if she wanted to, and besides she was in America.

So Mr. Alan Smith will have to bring forth pretty strong proof to convince me that Mrs. Gallup was really composing another "curiosity of literature", or was, as one or two disbelievers call her, a fraud.

Judging by the letters I have seen sent to BACONIANA by disbelievers, it seems to be a far happier and easier life to visit libraries and places of record, examining books and papers contemporary with the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, trying to find some evidence to substantiate their ideas, whereas the real question is in the checking of Mrs. Gallup's work; but I suspect this entails far more time and energy in laborious concentration than they are prepared to give.

I wonder what it is these objectors to Mrs. Gallup dislike. Is it because it happens to be an American lady who first discovered by cipher the real story of the birth of Francis Bacon, which has always been a mystery, or is it they cannot bring themselves to believe in such a seemingly fantastic story?

It seems to me such a pity that controversy such as this—which is capable of proof by any doubter who has access to a copy of the 1623 Folio, and the necessary time and patience—should be the cause of so much contention in this honoured Society, devoted as it is, to the study of the works of Francis Bacon.

Yours faithfully,

H. C. BREACH

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Sir,

There has been a lot of propaganda recently on behalf of the theory that Marlowe was the real author of the Shakespeare plays. I must confess that I personally have not read the book if it has already been published; so am not competent to do more than ask the following question.

If Marlowe was the real author of the plays published anonymously before his death, why were they so published? Marlowe had no status to lose, being a person of no particular standing, with no reputation to preserve.

Also why was he so preciously guarded and preserved? There is sufficient evidence to show that he was an undesirable person, perhaps dangerous, and would have been far better under ground than above it.

Marlowe is accused of being an atheist. Such aethism is far from being apparent in the Shakespeare plays. On the contrary, the plays are encrusted with references, direct and indirect, to the bible (Geneva Version) and not a single blasphemous line or word is to be found in the Shakespeare plays.

Has any correspondence to or from Marlowe survived from any poet or man of letters?

If Marlowe was the dramatist of Shakespeare's and Marlowe's plays, why is he not caricatured by Ben Jonson and others? Would old Ben have been silent if Marlowe had been still living? I think not. He had nothing to fear from Marlowe: not even a dagger thrust. Old Ben could look after himself both with the pen and the sword.

Finally it seems much more likely that if Marlowe was not killed in the tavern brawl, he escaped out of the country to avoid other unpleasant incidents in England.

The very fact that the Marlowe plays were not published under that name until after his death, when he would not be in a position to make any protest, is a strong pointer to the suggestion that his name was used as a mask to shield the true author.

Yours faithfully,

L. BIDDULFE

To the Editor of BACONIANA

ANOTHER JEU D'ESPRIT

Dear Sir,

There appears to be a class of acrostic signatures which come under the heading of *jeu d'esprit*. By some manipulation of the text embodying an instruction or hint, the reader is led to complete what otherwise might seem to be an unfinished name.

The best known example is to be found at the end of Scene 1, Act 1, "The First Part of Henry the Fourth", (Folio p. 49); the thirteenth mispagination, (for p. 47):

... we must neglect

O	Our holy purpose to Ierusalem.
C	Cosin, on Wednesday next, our Councell we will hold
A	At Windsor, and so informe the Lords:
B	But come your selfe with speed to vs againe,
For	For more is to be said, and to be done, Then out of anger can be vttered.

West. (moreland). I will my Liege. *Exeunt.*

The further instruction lies in the last line of the King's speech: "The N out of anger can be vttered."

This gives the usual F. BACON but on inspection, we can see further details:

1. Single Acrostic = F. BACO
Baco = "For Bacon"
2. This is keyed by the "For" from the text.
3. The intention then is clearly "FOR BACON".

Experience has shown that when matters are found at the end of things we can be sure to find something at the beginning. In "Shakespearean Acrostics", Mr. Edward D. Johnson has already shown this item at the beginning of the play and scene:

SO shaken as we are, so wan with care,
Finde we a time for frighted Peace to pant,
And breath shortwinded accents of new broils
To be commenced in Stronds a-farre remote:

No more the ...

The acrostic is SO FAT, an echo of the words "pant" and "shortwinded". Here we may remember that Bacon once made a note to remember to control his breathing when speaking. However, I think there is the possibility of another recondite joke, in Latin, like "Hang-hog" = *suspendere*; SUS = PIG; *pendere* = to hang down. FAT = *obesus*.

Here is another acrostic of the *jeu d'esprit* kind which I think will be new to readers of BACONIANA:

The beginning of Scene 2, Act 3, Henry VIII (Folio Text) is:

NORF.	<i>Norf.</i> If you will now vnite in your Complaints,
A	And face them with a Constancy, the Cardinall
C	Cannot stand under them. If you omit
"The"	The offer of this time, I cannot promise,
B	But that you shall sustaine more new disgraces, With these you beare alreadie.

Here the instruction is "... omit 'The' ..." and when we do so we readily get FR.BACON or "But Fr.Bacon".

The intention seems to be that Bacon wishes to identify himself with the fate of Cardinal Wolsey in the play.

Yours truly,

ARDEN.

It should be clearly understood that BACONIANA is a medium for the discussion of subjects connected with the Objects of the Society, but the Council does not necessarily endorse opinions expressed by contributors or correspondents.